

Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency.

When I talk about the banks, I do not mean to indict every bank and every banker. I firmly support the idea that banks must make a profit in our system. I recognize that there are many, many good banks and conscientious bank executives. But these facts do not alter my concern over the domination of the banking industry by a handful of huge banks. These big banks actually work to the detriment of other financial institutions as well as the rest of the economy.

The whole country, I believe, is appalled by the revelations of infiltration of banks by criminal elements. This infiltration is extremely serious for bank depositors, stockholders, FDIC insurance, and the general public. As you know, our Domestic Finance Subcommittee investigated this area earlier this year. This included a look at the Crown Savings Bank of Newport News, Va., which was closed a year ago. Our investigation showed clearly that over \$2 million of this bank's funds were used to finance and facilitate loan sharking, gambling, numbers rackets, fraudulent money order sales, and passing of forged securities. This activity was carried on all down the east coast from New York to Georgia.

This bank's situation is serious enough in itself, but such activities apparently exist in some other banks. During his appearance before our committee, Chairman K. A. Randall, of the FDIC, admitted that at the present time, FDIC has 199 banks on its problem list with aggregate deposits of \$1.829 billion.

I am also appalled by the apparent cooperation of many banks with loan-shark operations. In investigating the Federal Services Finance Corporation—a loan operation specializing in fast-shuffle deals with military personnel—we discovered that nearly 100 commercial banks had been providing this finance company with substantial lines of credit.

Now these things must be stopped and the Federal banking agencies simply are not doing the job. I do not accuse these officials with wrong-doing or impugn their motives. But, I do say that the decisions of these agencies invariably carry the appearance of a rubberstamp for the positions of the banks. Seldom is the public interest taken into consideration.

The Congress should move now to bring reform to the banking agencies and to include safeguards for the public. First, I think all of these agencies should come to Congress for appropriations annually. This provides an annual review of their activity—or lack of activity. Under present conditions, all three are financed outside of the public domain. The FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency are financed by funds provided by the banks they supervise. This is like having the television networks finance the Federal Communications Commission or the airlines, the Federal Aviation Agency. This is terrible public policy and the Congress should correct this now. Every taint of banker domination should be removed from these agencies.

Now the Federal Reserve Board, of course, claims to be independent of everyone, the public, the Congress, and the President. They get their funds through interest from Government bonds they hold. They are not audited by any Government agency and they do not have to come to Congress for a dime.

Just how bad this situation has become is plainly illustrated by some recent hearings by the Banking and Currency Committee. The committee had been holding hearings on H.R. 7601, providing for cancellation of \$30 billion of U.S. bonds held by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York for the Federal Open Market Committee. The total open market portfolio is now \$38.5 billion, on which the

taxpayers are required to pay almost \$1.5 billion a year in interest.

In his testimony at the hearing, William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, admitted that the Federal Reserve had paid for these bonds once with the money and credit of the United States and that they would have to be paid again when due. This is similar to a situation where a houseowner paid off his mortgage and was then required to continue paying interest on it, and then pay it off again when the maturity date comes around. It would be illegal and absurd in the case of an individual, but that is exactly what the Government is required to do under our present banking structure.

William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, is openly defiant about his ability to ignore public policy. He recently told me in a Joint Economic Committee hearing that "the Federal Reserve Board has the authority to act independently of the President" even "despite the President."

Of course, the problem of the Federal Reserve System is of much greater magnitude than the other two agencies. The Federal Reserve, through its Open Market Committee determines the Nation's supply of money and the interest rates. It has, in effect, near life and death control over economic policy.

In recent months, the Federal Reserve Board, led by its Chairman, has been tightening up on the supply of money, and forcing interest rates up.

The Federal Reserve Board's efforts to reconstruct their tight money line flies in the face of repeated statements by this administration in favor of plentiful credit at reasonable interest. Mr. Martin chooses to ignore these policies.

Once again, we have a prime example of the folly of allowing our monetary policy to be controlled largely by the bankers in disregard of a public policy as enunciated by the President and the Congress.

Through the years, tight money and rising interest rates have cost the American consumer billions of dollars. Tight money and high interest rates serve no useful public purpose. They have been a serious drag on the growth of the country, an out-and-out waste.

For an 11-year period from 1953 to 1963 inclusive, rising interest rates imposed an excess interest cost of \$15.7 billion upon the Federal budget; \$2.3 billion upon States and localities; and \$32.1 billion upon all private borrowers. And the figures keep on growing.

Tight money hurts every housewife who buys a washing machine, every farmer who buys a tractor, every homeowner. Every taxpayer has paid his share of the rising interest costs on the national debt.

So long as the Federal Reserve System remains under banker domination and beyond the reach of executive and legislative control, our welfare is imperiled. In my view, the most important economic and governmental problem facing the Nation today is the need for immediate rehabilitation of the Federal Reserve System, so that it is again subject to the will of the people, acting through their elected representatives.

If the big bankers are able to have their way they will continue to encourage monetary policies that will produce larger and larger public debt and higher and higher interest rates. If they have their way, our national debt will be \$600 billion in 15 years, which, at a 6-percent rate of interest, will cost the taxpayers \$36 billion a year. This would mean that so much of Federal revenues would be required for debt-carrying charges that insufficient funds, if any at all, would be available for veteran's programs, social welfare, housing, community health, and the many other services needed by our people.

Monetary policy is the public's business and it should not be controlled absolutely

by a handful of bureaucrats operating independently of everyone but the big bankers.

You veterans of World War I got a real sampling of the bankers' attitudes when they opposed payment of your Adjusted Service Certificates. You won that fight over great odds.

Now, today, I would like to call on you to lead another fight to gain a permanent reform of our monetary system so that it is responsive to the will and the needs of the people. If we do not gain this reform, then many of our past victories in behalf of the American veteran will be wasted.

The Stupidity of Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the demonstrations this past weekend against the war in Vietnam, it is important to bring James Reston's column in Sunday's New York Times to the attention of my colleagues.

As I have said on many occasions, I will continue to support the President in his efforts to obtain a negotiated settlement and to convince the North Vietnamese that the United States will not abandon South Vietnam. As Mr. Reston points out, these student pickets are frustrating their objective of an end to the fighting in Vietnam. They are confusing Hanoi, and, thus, are not promoting peace but postponing it.

Mr. Reston's column follows:

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi-Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now

A5836

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 18, 1965

out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western World about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950 and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will in the end give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations, the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscientious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft-dodgers, and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent, not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

Impressions of U.S.S.R. and Four Satellite Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. R. S. Chaffer of 85 Second Street, San Francisco, wrote me the following letter, together with a summary of his impressions of Russia and the four satellite countries. I think his findings are very interesting and I know they will be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Both his letter and impressions follow:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

October 12, 1965.

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My wife and I have just returned from a trip to Russia and the four satellite countries—East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

Attached is a summary of our impressions. We were unable to talk to any of the people in their own language because we do not speak their language. Our conversations were limited to talking to local guides, "Intourist" conductors, hotel desk, and store personnel who spoke English. But we could see how people live, see how they dress, and observe facial expressions. It was an educational trip, but we do not care to go again.

My purpose in writing is to convey to you my firm belief that our Nation is gradually going down the socialist trail by one law after another and by one "government grab" after another. This leads but to one final result—an economy run by government such as the Soviet bloc people want to escape and which their government now recognizes does not get cooperation of the people.

By some means we must make the rank and file of our population who voted for this administration realize that you can't get something for nothing and you can't continue the give away programs without eventually giving away all our substance, our strength and our freedom.

I urge you, sir, to speak out in this regard.

Yours truly,

R. S. CHAFFER.

IMPRESSIONS OF U.S.S.R. AND FOUR SATELLITE COUNTRIES BASED ON A 23-DAY BUS TOUR DURING SEPTEMBER 1965

Main highways are two lane like our country roads except near Moscow. An average highway scene within one-half mile is three trucks, one bus, two teams of horses, several people walking—maybe one car every half hour. You see a gas station about every 50 miles with a line of trucks waiting for service.

All property is owned by the state or collectives.

Stores have plenty of supplies but few clerks who are in no hurry to serve you; so people que up in line for service.

No religious freedom in U.S.S.R. but in the satellites there is.

Women have to work—children are cared for in state schools or day homes. Men and women work side by side—in field, driving trucks, splicing cable, laying brick, sweeping streets, working on heavy construction.

Each country puts a "state intourist" guide on each visiting bus. Our five intourist guides were nervous, all chewed their nails till they bled, all were noncommittal about any strategic building or plant or construction job.

The Russian microwave towers are tubes about 6 feet in diameter, 100 feet high, with guy wires.

In Russia we made "bush" rest stops in lieu of using stinky sheds called toilets with no plumbing facilities. Men to the left, women to the right and find a bush to get behind.

Extensive war damage and poor housing have caused the building of thousands of apartment houses in the U.S.S.R. and satellite countries and thousands more are under construction—10 story—40 to 120 apartments—500 new apartments ready to occupy each day in Moscow. Millions of people are employed on this project.

When they say "the Kremlin" its like saying "the White House." The Kremlin is a bunch of large buildings within a 40-foot wall—a 1,000-year-old fort on a slight rise and Moscow is built around it.

Hotels would rate third-class here—clean linen, dirty floors, toilets and plumbing constantly drip, meals very heavy consisting of bersch, french fries, black bread, fried steak or breaded meat, thick gravy, lemonade which we called "Lenin-ade," beer, tea, or coffee, ice cream or pastry.

U.S.S.R. is huge—it has 11 time zones—all land is in use, either farms, forests or reforestation—could drop Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys between the Polish-Russian border and Moscow and hardly see them.

There is much farm machinery, many powerplants, factories, processing plants, railroad yards, trucks and tractors. The U.S.S.R. looks strong.

From the appearance of buildings, roads, hotel rooms, Moscow streets, etc., it is evident that maintenance is poor, people don't care—they just put in their time.

From this I have some impressions:

1. Historically the farmers and uneducated workers had nothing—now they are better off—they each have 1 acre of land which they can farm and make what they can—in addition to their regular job. And there is an education program for the children. They have many large universities and technical schools. Education is a large factor in current trends away from strict government control.

2. The former educated people, shop owners, plant owners, business managers and aristocrats have lost their property and assets through state confiscation. They have been reduced to workers in order to live. This large capable group has no incentive to produce or improve for these reasons. I believe this group is also helping force the state to swing away from strict controls in central government and to grant more freedoms and the use of some capitalistic principles.

3. The state and its present ruling class have supplanted the previous owners, aristocracy and managers. The highest wage to a few individuals is \$500 per month, but they can supplement this by subsidizing rent, food, summer villas, etc.—they can't amass a fortune. Our Russian intourist guide was with us 11 days. He is a Moscow University graduate doing part-time graduate work. He speaks fluent English, French, and German besides several Russian dialects. His full-time pay as guide is 110 rubles (\$122.10), per month. I believe this setup is also a factor in changes taking place.

4. Equal employment in Russia means the opportunity and requirement for women to work beside their men to dig potatoes and beets, swing the scythe, pitch hay, drive trucks, splice cables, sweep streets and gutters, work on heavy construction job.

5. Medicare in Russia means that if you are sick you must first find a dispensary and hope there is a doctor on duty. He will not know you or have a case history. He may be able to see you in the dingy quarters these places occupy. The nurses I saw in

which I think is a discredit and a disgrace to this country in which we live.

We have only one country, Mr. President. I would hope that those who carry on these demonstrations would recognize that as citizens of this country, they have a responsibility, and that they should act with maturity. What is happening, in effect, is to undermine what the President of the United States is trying to do, as he has said time and time again, to bring about a negotiated settlement of the situation in Vietnam. What these people have done is furnish fodder to Hanoi, to Peiping, and to the Vietcong. What they have done has been a disservice to this country.

There are many of us who have questions on our minds about Vietnam. Not the least among them is the President himself, who has tried through every possible avenue he could think of to bring this matter to an honorable conclusion.

What is happening on the part of demonstrators, who show a sense of utter irresponsibility and lack of respect, who openly flout obeying the law, is to place this country in a position which is unbecoming a republic of stature and dignity.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with all other Senators, I swell with great pride in listening to a great American, Mike Mansfield, a great leader of his political party, in the splendid comments he has just made.

The vicious, venomous, and vile leaders of this infamous movement who attempt to influence young people of this country to evade the draft by fraud and chicanery is an ugly page in the history of the Nation.

Let the whole world clearly understand that the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States, now almost 200 million strong, stand for law and order, stand for orderly processes, and support the foreign policy of the Government of the United States, when our country faces danger, particularly as my able friend the Senator from Montana has just indicated, when the Chief Executive of this country is confronted with an honorable commitment to the free people of South Vietnam.

I am exceedingly proud that the Senator from Montana has commented as he has.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment my colleague, the Senator from California, as well as the great majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and associate myself with them in their remarks today.

I have been one of those who supported the President of the United States from scratch on the issue of Vietnam. Unfortunately, this issue is not being presented as fairly as it should be—this is true not only in the slums of our cities, where people are easily worked on, but also in our universities and colleges.

Thank God for the indication that the great majority of the students of America in its colleges and universities

are seeking to do the right thing and are beginning to make themselves heard on this very important question.

It is high time that the Senate took under consideration as a major part of its business the points which the Senator from California has just made.

I am only one Senator, but I am sure the Senator from California will agree with me that the Senate should pass a bill to punish, by fine or imprisonment, those who would seek to delay military personnel or military materiel. Such a bill is now pending in committee. I believe that before Congress adjourns, it should make sure that such a bill is enacted into law. There is so much to be said for its enactment, and so much more to be taken into consideration, that we should make it a major item of our business immediately, to punish those who would do a disservice to our land, to our military forces, and to all those who seek so assiduously to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.

I thank the Senator from California for yielding to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, very much. I associate myself with his remarks with respect to new legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, mention has been made concerning the pending bill, which would make it a crime for any person willfully, intentionally, and physically to interfere with the movement of troops, military equipment, or property. That bill was introduced by me. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is one of its cosponsors. I invite the Senator from California to become one at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be very glad to be a cosponsor. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The present occupant of the chair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], is also a cosponsor.

However, I wish to say to the representatives of the Departments of Defense and Justice that I cannot understand why they have not filed an appraisal of the bill with the Committee on the Judiciary.

When I first presented the bill, I made a study—through the experts—to determine whether there was any statute now on the books making it a crime to interfere with the movement of troops. The investigation disclosed that there was not.

For 1 month I have been in contact with both the Departments of Justice and Defense, begging them to file a report; but no report has yet been filed.

The Committee on the Judiciary is prepared to act immediately. It wishes to send the bill to the floor of the Senate. It is waiting for the appraisal of the merits of the bill from the two Departments. I just do not understand the reason for the delay.

This morning, Mr. Katzenbach stated

that the Department of Justice would investigate what happened throughout the Nation over the weekend.

With due respect to the heavy burden which the Attorney General carries, I wish he would take a look at the bill and report to the Committee on the Judiciary whether or not he feels it should be enacted into law. I expect that the Department of Defense likewise will make a determination whether it will or will not support such a bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As one of the many Senators who have joined the Senator from Ohio in the introduction of his bill making it a crime to interfere with and obstruct the movement of either Army personnel or materiel, I certainly join him in expressing the view that the Departments affected will render a prompt decision, recommendation, and opinion on the matter, because I believe that nothing will suffice so well as to enact a criminal statute dealing with this pressing problem.

I support the position completely.

AMERICAN PROTESTERS PROLONG VIETNAM WAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, of course, I enthusiastically support the views expressed by the majority leader and the minority whip, concerning interference with the draft. Any violation of the law that strikes so deeply at our security as a Nation must be prosecuted vigorously and swiftly. I support the views of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] which he expressed so vigorously on the floor of the Senate the other day, that this calculated program to defeat the draft must be yanked out by the roots.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we are discussing the demonstrations that took place last week that we believe to be harmful to the security of our country. More and more of these events will be happening unless we dig out the perpetrators and leaders of the operations. Between the 10th day of June and the 28th, at Ringwood, N.J., about 40 miles from New York, there was assembled a seminar led by Communist leaders of the United States. Between 75 and 80 students of universities were present. They were paid expenses incurred in going to and coming from the seminar. They were paid up to \$50 a week while operating in this particular field.

While they were at that seminar, they were prohibited from making any telephone calls to the outside world. They were forbidden to write letters. They were there to learn the Communist technique of inciting disorder and creating demonstrations.

It is estimated that the seminar in the neighborhood of Ringwood, N.J., cost \$100,000. The 75 to 80 students who were present left the seminar and moved back to their respective communities to carry out the teachings which were given them at that Communist operation.

The point I am trying to make, is that, substantially, these demonstrations are

October 18, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26291

Agency would acquire valid title to this land, which the language of section 3 would permit the Agency then to sell to the District of Columbia. The authorized price of \$32,896 represents the amount paid by the Agency to the railroads for their rights and interests therein.

The Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held public hearings on this resolution on August 19, 1965, and received testimony from the Redevelopment Land Agency and the Assistant Engineering Commissioner for the District of Columbia. There was no opposition expressed to the resolution. The committee is informed that the District of Columbia Commissioners, the Department of Justice, and the Bureau of the Budget have concurred in approval of this proposed legislation. Accordingly, your committee recommends that this resolution do pass.

DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL
"LITTLE NANCY"

The bill (H.R. 5217) to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade was announced as next in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the call of the calendar.

ANTIDRAFT MOVEMENT DISGRACEFUL AND DANGEROUS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, every decent American will applaud today's announcement by the Department of Justice that a national investigation of groups behind the antidraft movement is now underway. The Department informed me this morning that its investigation will include those contemptible groups agitating in California. Well it should. Over the weekend in Berkeley, a dirty little sheet has been distributed which is entitled "Brief Notes on the Ways and Means of Beating and Defeating the Draft." In recent days people have thrown themselves on railroad tracks in my State in an attempt to prevent passage of troop trains and railroad cars carrying military supplies to the docks for transshipment to southeast Asia. A few contemptible youths have publicly torn up their draft cards in great glee. In my State, the head of the California Democratic Council has enthusiastically praised those who have destroyed their draft cards. Governor Brown, head of the Democratic Party in my State, to his credit, has asked this person to resign, though he has been defended by the State president of the Young Democrats who notes that that organization has "gone on record advocating a shift in our Vietnam policy."

Attorney General Katzenbach has stated "there are some Communists involved" in this left-wing movement. Its ranks are replete with so-called conscientious objectors, beatniks, and those who in varying degrees oppose the southeast Asian policy of our Government.

Mr. President, I am a devoted believer in the right of constitutional free speech and of the constitutional right of any citizen to petition his Government, but what I have described here is far beyond the pale of reasonable or rational con-

stitutional discussion or petition. Indeed, what has gone on sows the seeds of treason.

This is an American problem and both our American political parties share a feeling of revulsion and a demand that the laws of this Nation, including the Selective Service Act, be respected and enforced.

The radical left in all its facets, gleefully infiltrated by Communists, undermines respect and faith in our American Government. What a shocking paradox it is that the radical right, and all its self-styled superpatriotic leaders, simultaneously alleges that our American Government is 60 to 80 percent dominated by Communists. Both extremes are a menace to this land. Thank God, they represent a very small percentage of the fine, decent, patriotic citizens of our country. Recently in Oakland, Calif., a group was formed under the name of Responsible Citizens Aroused. They held a rally over the weekend to counteract the activities of the so-called Vietnam Committee. I sent a telegram to them. I ask consent that a copy of my telegram to that group of fellow citizens and its statement on this general subject issued on Constitution Day be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 13, 1965.

ALEXANDER GRENDON,
Donner Laboratory, University of California,
Berkeley, Calif.:

Regret that Senate schedule prevents me from joining you and members of Responsible Citizens Aroused as you gather together on October 16 to reaffirm your faith in the principles of this Republic and to oppose irresponsible and dangerous actions by a few in our country who object to America's role in securing the cause of freedom in southeast Asia. Please express my best wishes to those who have gathered with you on this occasion. I believe that the overwhelming majority of Americans, regardless of party, support the President of the United States as he attempts to secure peace in that troubled part of the world through the use of American strength and the offer of American compassion.

Regards,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

STATEMENT OF RCA—RESPONSIBLE CITIZENS
AROUSED

Today, September 14, is Constitution Day. It is on this occasion that we remember the principles our country was founded upon and the men who have made it great.

But today we also mark with some degree of chagrin that there exists an element in our immediate community which openly challenges the basic framework of not only the community, but the Nation as a whole. This element, currently known as the Vietnam Day Committee, will, in 30 days, stage an organized riot for the purpose of amplifying their position. We would wonder how some of the defenders of our Constitution, such as Sergeant York, Nathan Hale, General MacArthur, and John F. Kennedy, would feel when reflecting upon the Vietnam Day Committee this Constitution Day of 1965.

Responsible Citizens Aroused believes in the principles of constitutional democracy upon which our Government is based.

RCA supports the President's role in the conduct of foreign affairs.

RCA believes in, trusts, and has faith in the discretion, dignity, and virtue of all American people.

RCA is a group of young, bay area people who intend to unite vocal support for our country and its principles and display to the community, the United States as a whole, and the world, that the bay area is populated by responsible Americans. RCA asks for other like-minded citizens to join this effort.

Let us make our position clear:

We are not objecting to picketing and peaceful demonstrations. As a matter of fact, picketing is an old tradition in America. We abhor war and desire a just peace. It is the U.S. leaders who are requesting negotiations. You hear no requests for negotiations from Peiping. We do not, however, subscribe to a policy of peace at the price of the freedom of the South Vietnamese.

The Vietnam Day Committee does not represent the feelings of Americans. Its actions have insulted the integrity of the American people. Its members have called the President of our country a "fascist" and a "dictator." They have called the former U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam a "murderer" and demanded he "stand trial" for his actions before five of their members. They have given the name of bay area cities and institutions a black eye all over the world.

We believe that the bay area community has been insulted long enough. It is now time for patriotic, responsible citizens to stand up in active support of their country and in opposition to the Vietnam Day Committee.

1. We call for pledges to attend a patriotic program on October 16 at a location to be announced, while the Vietnam Day Committee is "attacking" the Oakland Army Terminal. Major speakers are now being invited to address this program.

2. RCA calls for the public, Republicans and Democrats alike, to write their Representatives and Senators expressing support of our Government and the President.

3. RCA calls for contributions to provide advertising for the program and transportation for the speakers.

Contact: Responsible Citizens Aroused, 5350 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif., 655-8601.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have noted with growing concern the demonstrations which have been taking place throughout the Republic.

I believe in the right of assembly. I believe in the right of free speech. I believe in the right of petition. But I also believe in the law, and I believe in the law whether I personally agree with it or not.

I have been shocked at pictures showing some of the demonstrators using cigarette lighters to burn their draft cards. That is against the law. Within the past month Congress has made it against the law. I have been shocked to read that there are certain schools of thought—certain groups, that is—which are telling young folks how to avoid the draft; how, through the use of drugs, to place themselves in such a condition that the examining authorities would not find them eligible; how some of them have feigned mental illness, how some of them have posed as homosexuals, and how some of them have used other devices means to bring about a situation

October 18, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26293

the product of Communist leadership. Countless innocent, uninformed youth of the country are participating in them, not knowing that they are following the flag of the Reds and bowing to the voices of the Communists dictating how they shall create disorder and bring the United States into disrespect.

Mr. President, by unanimous consent, may I have 3 additional minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The meeting which I am describing as having taken place at Ringwood, N.J., took place between June 10 and June 28. What I have said is corroborated without question. This matter has been on my mind for the last 2 weeks, and I have been checking to ascertain whether the report is true or not.

Now I go to another matter. On September 11, 1965, at McMillin Theater at Columbia University in New York City there assembled the first panel of the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in the United States. They originally were supposed to meet at Rutgers University. However, when word got out that these Socialist scholars were to meet at Rutgers University, indignation flashed into the mind of a candidate for the Governor of New Jersey, State Senator Wayne Dumont, Jr. He called for the removal of the scholars on socialism. When he did, the decision was made to transfer the meeting from Rutgers University. Mr. Wayne Dumont, Jr., the man who raised the complaint, called for the removal of Prof. Eugene D. Genovese because of the latter's remarks at the Rutgers teach-in on Vietnam on last April 23, when Dr. Genovese said:

I am a Marxist and a Socialist. Therefore, unlike most of my distinguished colleagues here this morning, I do not fear or regret the impending Vietcong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it.

In other words, this scholar on socialism stated that he did not regret the impending victory of the Vietcong in South Vietnam; he welcomed it. The meeting was held in Columbia University on September 11, 1965, and various scholars of the Socialist philosophy were present.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Speakers were among others, Paul M. Sweezy, Connor Cruise O'Brien, Said Shah, Staughton Lynd, and Herbert Aptheker. One of them was a person who spoke about the riots in California, mentioned a moment ago by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. He addressed the last meeting. He repeated the words that were so often spoken at Watts, Calif.: "Burn baby burn"—meaning, burn down the buildings and the property and the houses in making protest against what is going on.

Mr. President, we cannot stand idly by with reference to this matter. The youth who are serving our country in South Vietnam are complaining about what we are tolerating back home. They are not complaining about the requirement to stand by their country. Every one of

them is responding willingly. There was in my office this morning a Lieutenant Kapelka. Perhaps he is in the gallery now. He received his notice to report to Vietnam. He said:

I am glad to go, but do something about stopping these disorders which are breaking down the morale within our country.

Whatever steps we take within the framework of the Constitution cannot be too severe in handling this problem.

Long-whiskered beatniks, dirty in clothes, worn down, seemingly, by a willingness to look like a beatnik, are the ones who are in the vanguard.

They are not entitled to our respect. In my judgment most of them are the antithesis of what a real patriot is. They do not have the backbone or courage to stand up for their country. They want to go into some hiding place completely devoid of the attributes and character of genuine true-blooded Americans. They are interfering with the lives of genuine American citizens, and with the security of our Nation.

I will in the next few days introduce a bill making it a Federal felony for a person to induce or influence a military person or a prospective draftee not to respond to the call of duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I regret that I have not heard all the statements made this morning on this subject, but I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my own profound contempt for these demonstrations, and my sickness of soul at the weakening of the body politic and the patriotism and spiritual life of this Nation that these demonstrations indicate.

Mr. President, on previous occasions I have said on the floor of the Senate that the fact that people in high places had encouraged campaigns of civil disobedience throughout this land in other cases would bring home at other times under other conditions campaigns of civil disobedience that would be much more far-reaching and dangerous than those they had encouraged.

One sure effect of these campaigns and demonstrations, will be to prolong the war in Vietnam. The prolongation of the war will certainly increase the casualty lists of American boys who are being sent there to support this country and its flag. Every protest will cause the Communists to believe they can win if they hold on a little longer.

The time has passed now to discuss the wisdom of our entrance into Vietnam. Many of us have varied opinions on that score. I was one of those who opposed our involvement in that conflict. But we are committed there now. Our flag is committed, our national honor is committed, our prestige is committed, and our whole power for the maintenance of world peace and avoidance of a nuclear war is laid squarely on the line in Vietnam today.

As for the young men taking part in these demonstrations, some of them are

pathetic because they are being misled by wily agitators. These boys do not know what they are doing.

Some of them are digging their own graves, because when they encourage Ho Chi Minh to extend and prolong this war, many of them will be caught up in the military draft. Some of them will be trained and sent to Vietnam. Many of them will not come back.

Either that or they will wind up behind the bars and finally receive a dishonorable discharge. They will go through life dishonored and die unsung. They will have failed in the first duty of man—to defend his homeland—and in this case the greatest way of life ever known.

Mr. President, I would that there were some way to reach and punish those who encourage and incite these young people.

On yesterday afternoon I paid a visit to Walter Reed Hospital where I had an opportunity to talk to seven or eight battle casualties of the Vietcong who had been flown back to this country. Without exception, the first thing that each of these men mentioned was these demonstrations. They asked what Congress proposed to do about them. There is a great feeling of bitterness on the part of men who have been out there on foreign soil that American citizens without let or hindrance, and without vigorous condemnation from the press and other media of communication, are permitted to take steps that will slow down the war and inspire the hopes of eventual victory in the mind of Ho Chi Minh.

He has stated again and again that the American people do not have the patience to carry to a successful conclusion the kind of war he intends to fight there. These demonstrations will lead him to believe that impatience with the war, and war weariness, on which he so strongly depends, is already being manifested in this country.

It takes but a handful of people in a demonstration of this kind to generate the opinion overseas that there is a great mass of similar thought, because this is one of the few countries on earth where there can be public demonstrations of this kind against a fixed policy of the Government.

We pay a terrible price sometimes for the freedom to demonstrate in this country, and we pay too great a price when it amounts to a conspiracy to injure the U.S. fighting man 10,000 miles away.

I hope that all of those in positions of power—all of those who encouraged these other demonstrations—will now come out and say this one is aiding a foreign enemy and that we must find a means to deal with it.

It is sad, indeed, to think that so many foolish, misled young people who will themselves be caught up in the draft and may pay the penalty of their lives because their demonstrations have encouraged Ho Chi Minh and the Chinese to think that if they will just hold on a while longer, just carry on the war for a few more months or years, the American people will eventually weary of it and pull out.

We cannot leave now, Mr. President. If we do, we will leave behind in that country, where this dirty war is being

fought, in the jungles and rice paddles—if we tuck tail and run now—the heritage of greatness, freedom, and courage that has marked this country since its birth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the spectacle of young men, willing to perish themselves to avoid the draft and willing to let the world know that they do not support other young Americans arrayed in battle in Vietnam in the cause of freedom, is enough to make any person loyal to his country weep.

Ascribing the blame to Communist influence or to leaders of pacifist causes is a subterfuge which does not come to grips with the real issue and does not place the blame where it belongs; namely, on the wailing, quailing, protesting young men themselves.

Where in the name of conscience is their sense of history?

They can indulge in this counterfeit undertaking because this is a free land. But it is a free land because other young men long before them faced up to their duty to make it so and keep it so.

Perhaps they have forgotten that men fought at Valley Forge under ghastly conditions for 22 cents a day or perhaps they are so cynical and cowardly as not to care.

Perhaps they have forgotten that the signers of the Declaration of Independence were hounded to their graves, and perhaps they do not care.

Perhaps they have forgotten that two generations ago, millions of young Americans went to the corners of the earth to resist autocracy and that thousands of them did not return alive.

Perhaps they have forgotten that 17 million were in uniform a generation ago to defend the cause of freedom against dictators.

It is high time they begin to rethink their history and what it cost to give them the lush benefits of a free country.

Shakespeare was right. He said:

Cowards die many times before their death. The valiant never taste of death but once.

What a tragic future lies ahead for such craven souls.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, I should like to add my word on the subject of the young people who hold meetings and teach-ins and who try to find ways to dodge the draft and avoid military service.

I feel certain that every Senator has had the experience I have had of having to write the parents of young boys who have been killed in Vietnam. They are difficult letters to write. I know something of how those parents feel because Mrs. Saltonstall and I lost a son in World War II.

When, after writing a letter to bereaved parents of servicemen killed in action, I read about the fact that young men and women in various parts of the country—and especially in my own city of Boston where they paraded last Saturday and held a meeting on Boston Common—when I read that young people are organizing against American policy and refusing to meet their service obligations, I am shocked.

As the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, put it so well in New York recently before the Conference of NATO Parliamentarians, it is because we believe so much in the integrity of our country's word that we are giving assistance to the Vietnamese. We have stated that we will help them to maintain their freedom and to maintain their own way of life as they wish to do.

Therefore when we hear, read, and see pictures of these demonstrations we are shocked to think that the participants have no knowledge or understanding of the problem that exists or of what our country is doing to try to solve it. None of us want American lives to be lost. We all want a peaceful world.

I hope that the words that are expressed in this body today will have some effect on the professors and others who are teaching these young people as well as on the leaders of this campaign who are stimulating the young people to act as they have been acting. I hope that the heads of institutions which permit these activities to take place will, while they safeguard freedom of speech, also promote patriotism.

We know the situation in Vietnam is a serious one, to which our Government is giving a great deal of attention and thought. It is taking what it believes to be the right steps. Some boys will not return from Vietnam. The boys who are there, who are suffering and are exposed to danger, are those who deserve our support—not those who are trying to avoid their duty to their country.

I commend Senators who have spoken on this subject this morning. I am proud and honored to join with them.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today, for the reason that at 4 o'clock on Sunday morning I returned from a 19-day visit to southeast Asia. Because of the time differential of 12 hours between Vietnam and Washington, I thought I would rather get my feet on the ground before I made a report to the Senate of my observations there. I desire, of course, to be exceedingly careful and to go over my notes, so that I will not disclose, in the Senate or outside the Senate, any top secret or classified matter that came to my attention. However, I feel that I should mention one or two incidents at this time.

I was assigned to the visit by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and I, as members of that committee, went first to Korea as guests of the Government of Korea and at the expense of the Government of Korea. The Korean Government requested that this great Nation be represented at their Armed Services Day, when they said goodbye to a fine, lean, well-trained division of Koreans—ROK's, as they are called—who were sent to Vietnam to aid in the struggle against Communist aggression. We were present at the departure of 22,000 young men, highly trained soldiers, of Korea.

By the way, on my return trip, when I stopped briefly at Clark Air Force Base Hospital in the Philippine Islands, two of the ROK soldiers who had been in Vietnam were already casualties and were being treated in the hospital.

Today I merely wish to speak briefly pertaining to the subject discussed earlier. In the course of the days—and they were hard, long days, extending from early in the morning until night, while in every part of Vietnam, and then in every part of Thailand—I spoke with and shook hands with almost 200 Ohio boys who are serving there in our Armed Forces.

When I asked each of those boys, "Have you any problem?" The answer was practically unanimous: "No, no problem; no problem, sir." Perhaps 2 of almost 200 boys had some problem or grievance, and as one who has served as a private in our Armed Forces, and later as an officer, I could only think that they were liabilities of Uncle Sam from the moment they were inducted into the armed services.

The morale of our soldiers in southeast Asia is of the highest. They have no problems.

I am sure that they are not interested whatever in what the extremists do in this country, and that it has no effect on them.

Recently, in Vietnam, in a tent in a receiving hospital for the armed services, with the temperature around 100 degrees, I saw seven women nurses who were assigned to that hospital. Three of them were there at the time, assigned to work around the clock. In going around and shaking hands with the wounded, I was told, "There is an Ohioan here." Right at the end, I came across a young man, John Hart, of Cuyahoga County, who lived in the neighborhood where I lived some 15 years ago. He is a fine athletic young man. His right leg was amputated below the knee. I talked with him and said: "I am going to talk with your parents when I return to Washington. I shall call them in Cleveland."

He and I talked briefly. When I was leaving the hospital shortly after—and this is something that made me feel very good—the head nurse said: "Senator, I want you to know that that young man was feeling very despondent. His best friend had been killed and he was feeling very low because of losing part of his right leg. When you spoke to him and told him that modern medical science had done miracles and would continue to do miracles, and that, while perhaps he will not be able to play football, he will certainly be able to bowl and enjoy certain other activities, I believe that you helped him greatly. I was fearful about him. However, after you finished, I no longer have any feeling of fear."

Shortly after that, at Clark Air Base Hospital in the Philippine Islands, I learned that this young man had already been sent to Walter Reed Hospital. I have an appointment to see him tonight. That is the story of merely one young man who nearly gave his life for his country.

While I was at that hospital, another soldier died. Others were very cheerful

October 18, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26295

and said, "We are just wounded and will be back in combat soon."

The practice is that if they are seriously and permanently disabled, they are sent back to their homes as soon as possible. If they are slightly injured, then, while the extremists are denouncing the fighting, they are sent back to their units, and they continue to fight. As the chairman of our committee stated, it is too late to say that we should not have gone there in 1954, because we are now there, and we have every reason to be proud of the conduct of our soldiers there.

I assure my colleagues that the morale of our soldiers in Vietnam is not being disturbed in the least by what a few extremists in this country may be saying or doing.

AMERICAN VIETNAM PROTESTERS PROLONG VIETNAM WAR

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, if the Bill of Rights—the very heart of this democracy of ours—is to mean something, the right to protest must be preserved, even when that protest contradicts what most of us regard as our country's clear interest.

The right of protest is feeble and empty if it must confine itself to matters that concern us little, or on which the Nation's vital interests are not touched.

It is only when the protest offends us and seems to strike at our country's deepest purposes that the meaning of our Bill of Rights—the right to disagree and protest in this democracy—is really tested.

Thus, Mr. President, while I vehemently disagree with the protests against our Vietnam policy, while I am convinced that they are woefully in error, and while I am convinced that they do our cause in Vietnam a grievous disservice, nevertheless where they are lawful and non-violent, they are in accordance with the essence of our free democracy—the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President in an article published in the New York Times this morning, James Reston points out that one of the supreme ironies of recent years is that these protesters are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and are creating all the things they fear the most.

They are not promoting peace, because if there is any hope remaining in the hearts of the Vietcong and their leaders in Hanoi and Peiping, it is the distant wish that somehow the American people disapprove the Vietnam war and will make their disapproval felt, reverse our Vietnam policies and call our troops home.

It is this wish—this gross misreading of the attitude of the American people—which more than anything else is keeping the war going, in spite of our immense power superiority and our solid military victories. It is this which is preventing peace.

And what is fostering the wish that keeps war going but the protests of the so-called peace marchers themselves?

As Reston says, they are not persuading the President or the Congress,

but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has clearly and carefully spoken his desire for peace and negotiations, not once, but many times. This country's leaders want peace, and any protester who can read must in his heart know that.

If these peace marchers want peace, the best contribution they can make is to address their plea to the Communists. Let the Communists know that this country is ready to negotiate and that this country will keep on a massive military pressure until they negotiate; but let the Communists know that even the peace groups in this country now recognize that if peace is to be had in southeast Asia, it will never come from an American surrender, but from a Communist recognition of the reality of military power and a Communist recognition of the absolute determination of this country to pay whatever price is necessary to keep our commitment to South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred by James Reston in today's New York Times be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western World about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He files regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that Commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teaching in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950 and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will, in the end, give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscientious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft dodgers and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent, not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2092) to amend the Agricul-

tural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2(3) is amended by inserting "such container and pack requirements provided in section 8(c) (6) (H)", immediately after "establish and maintain".

(c) The proviso at the end of section 8(c) (I) is amended by inserting: ", carrots, citrus fruits, onions, Tokay grapes, fresh pears, dates, plums, nectarines, celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados" immediately after "applicable to cherries".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, S. 2092, was passed by the Senate some time ago. It went over to the House and was amended by the House. That amendment is contained in the message from the House.

I shall ask that the House amendment be concurred in as amended by an amendment which I send to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 11, after "limes," insert "olives, pecans."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, S. 2092, as passed by the Senate, would permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to include provisions for paid advertising.

This bill was introduced by me at the request of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association. It covers products which are produced in Florida, as elsewhere, and simply refers to marketing agreements.

The House amendment extends the Senate provision to the following additional fruits and vegetables: carrots, citrus fruits, onions, Tokay grapes, fresh pears, dates, plums, and nectarines. The House amendment also authorizes the container and pack requirements of marketing orders to be effective when the price of the commodity is above parity. The present law does not permit that except when the price is below parity.

The amendment I am offering to the House amendment would add olives and pecans to the commodities covered by the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] requested, on behalf of pecan producers of his State and elsewhere, that that commodity be added. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] requested on behalf of the olive producers in his State that that commodity also be added to this bill.

The Department of Agriculture has advised informally that it has no objection to the inclusion of olives and pecans in the bill, and so far as we have been able to determine there is no objection

in the House. The bill merely provides authority which may be used if the Secretary finds that it will be useful, and if the producers approve it by at least two-thirds in number or volume in a referendum.

At the time of reporting S. 2092, the committee gave some consideration to a proposal of the National Milk Producers Federation that milk be added to the commodities covered by the bill. At that time the committee felt that marketing orders for milk are substantially different from marketing orders applicable to other commodities and the inclusion of advertising authority for milk would therefore present a somewhat different situation than for other commodities. In fact, the form of the bill would have to be completely changed since marketing research and development projects are not now authorized for milk. There is sentiment on the part of some members of our committee for the extension of this authority to milk. In addition to writing to the committee just prior to the time the committee reported S. 2092, the National Milk Producers Federation offered testimony at page 1139 of the committee's hearings on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, suggesting a draft bill to provide such authority for milk. I do not, however, suggest that milk be added at this time. Milk marketing orders do differ substantially from those for fruits and vegetables, and I do believe that a separate bill should be introduced for milk by the sponsors of such a proposal, so that the views of all interested persons could be obtained and the committee could have the advantage of their testimony.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a moment.

My able friend, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], has once again indicated his dedication to American agriculture and his ability to bring about a successful solution to the problem.

I thank the Senator on behalf of the olive agriculture industry in my State for accepting its position which will be included in this rather excellent piece of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to my able friend the senior Senator from Florida may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1965.

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture
Production, Marketing and Stabilization
of Prices, Senate Committee on Agriculture
and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPESSARD: I enclose a copy of the letter from Congressman HARLAN HAGEN, of California, with reference to H.R. 10206 now before your committee. He notes that this legislation permits certain specified commodities which are under Federal marketing orders to expend money for advertising and promotion. He states that he understands the olive industry would like to have olives included in the list of stipulated commodities which could take advantage of this provision. I wonder if it would be possible

to include canned olives in this legislation when it is reported from your committee? If you feel testimony is needed from the olive industry on this, I would be glad to contact Mr. R. W. Henderson to whom Congressman HAGEN refers.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my able friend, the senior Senator from Florida, for the service that he has rendered to American agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the House amendments.

The amendment to the House amendments was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on concurring in the House amendments as amended.

The amendments of the House, as amended, were concurred in.

THE GI BILL: AN INVESTMENT, NOT A COST

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 20 years ago this fall, the veterans of the Second World War began to enroll in the educational institutions of this country under the GI bill. Although many people had doubts about the success of this bill, there has been no better proof in our history of education being an investment, not merely a cost.

In the September issue of American Education magazine, a publication begun this year by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. John R. Emens, president of Ball State Teachers College in Muncie, Ind., has written an article entitled, "Education Begets Education." In this article, Dr. Emens describes the vast contributions to this Nation which have come from the World War II GI bill. There is no reason to doubt that similar great and lasting benefits to the Nation will come from the cold war GI bill which this body passed this year by a vote of more than 4 to 1, but which now seems to be bottled up in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Dr. Emens described what happened under the GI bill of World War II when the colleges first opened their doors to veterans in the fall of 1945. He said:

Twenty years ago this fall the first veterans of the Second World War began to enroll in the Nation's educational institutions. They were the beneficiaries of one of the most remarkable acts of faith in America's history—the GI bill of rights. Two decades have passed. Today thousands of the estimated 1,445,000 students beginning college are the children of those former members of the Armed Forces, many of whom were the first of their family lines who had the opportunity of a higher education.

This is, therefore, the anniversary of a precedent-setting moment in our country. An act of Congress was to change the lives of millions of Americans and directly influence the decisions of their children.

October 18, 1965

here are expended in civic action programs. This is not to sell our military role short, for without security and an area free of enemy combat units, the civic action program is not possible. Security is a prerequisite for area improvement, but I would say that 80 percent of our teams' efforts are taken up in this program. We have supervised the building of 39 new schools in the past year; rural electrification is expanding; numerous road and bridge projects have been completed, with more in the planning stages, and 12 medical-aid stations have been established. These are but few of the many projects being paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.

I would be the first to admit that there are many seemingly convincing arguments opposing our presence in Vietnam, to wit: "This is a civil war to be fought to its ultimate conclusion by the Vietnamese without our interference"; "We can never win a land war in Asia"; "We are killing helpless women and children"; or "Life is meaningless to these people and it's not worth the sacrifice of one American life." How easy it would be to follow these lines of reasoning, to go home to our loved ones and to say "to hell with this place." But, would this be a realistic solution to our problem? Would things improve? I am convinced that not 5 percent of the 120,000 people in our district would be willing to live under communism. Certainly, the Catholics wouldn't. I am equally convinced that without our assistance they could not last 2 months against an enemy supported from the north who would gobble up the villages one by one until there was nothing left. What would be the solution for these people? Should we repartition the partition established in the Geneva Convention of 1954? Should we tell everyone who wishes to live in a democracy to move south of Saigon and then in a few years, as bands of Vietcong resume their subversion and terrorism, repartition again, and then again, until those millions of people who don't wish to live under communism have been pushed into the sea?

And how would you suggest that we inform these people who believe in us and look to us for assistance in this struggle? Should I go to the village fathers and tell them that I am very sorry but the Americans have decided that "we are the true aggressors in this local war; that we have discovered that every time we send planes to the North to bomb the bridges and roads that are used to bring men, ammunition, and weapons used to attack their villages that we risk the chance of killing and maiming innocent victims; that we have discovered that every time our armed helicopters are called to assist one of their besieged villages, we end up killing the attacking 'farmers'; that we have found that we are taking unfair advantage of the Vietcong's lack of sophisticated weaponry; that we are gunning down in cold blood an ill-equipped, underfed guerrilla foot soldier with our sleek, push button supersonic jets when he is attacking their village with an outmoded Russian gun, and that we have determined that this is not in keeping with the American tradition of fairplay and good sportsmanship?"

In conclusion, I would say that our ancestors might be quite proud of our efforts here in Vietnam, and perhaps even prouder of the true "embattled farmers of 1965" in their fight for freedom. It is a discouraging war and the closer you get to it, the more you realize what a senseless and tragic lesson in futility war can be as an attempt to solve man's problems. I only hope that the strength of our convictions and our determination to see this war to a just conclusion will convince our adversaries that they have selected the wrong course of action. This, in turn, might direct them toward the conference table, our only hope for peace in Vietnam.

I would entreat a gracious and loving God in His infinite wisdom to impart a sense of prudence and rational thinking to all those in positions of responsibility and authority. Without the support of those we respect and believe in, our cause here is meaningless and futile. I also ask your prayers for those who carry out our country's policies, whether you agree with those policies or not. It is not exactly enjoyable to be the man with the finger on the trigger or on the bombsight, but we cannot falter before the challenge that faces us, we cannot turn our back on choosing between right and wrong, and we cannot avoid our obligation to our fellow man.

I realize that this letter is a one-sided opinion of one man, and I would welcome hearing from you or anyone else on the subject. If you would be interested, I would be more than willing to ask some of our Vietnamese friends to write to you and express their views.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. AINSWORTH.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues I have been extremely disturbed and disgusted by the demonstrations staged over the past several days to protest our policy in Vietnam.

I was even more disturbed to learn from press reports that the nationwide series of demonstrations this weekend was planned and coordinated by an organization based in my own State of Wisconsin at Madison, our capital.

The right of free speech and free assembly is basic to our system and these students and others are certainly free to express their views on this subject. With this freedom, however, comes the responsibility of knowing the true facts on Vietnam and of realizing the consequences of their action.

Already the Chinese Communists and the Communist press in China, North Vietnam, and other areas are pointing to these demonstrations as an indication of widespread American dissatisfaction with U.S. policy. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We all know that these demonstrators are a vocal but small minority of our people. Unfortunately, however, this fact may not be apparent to the rest of the world.

The effects of these demonstrations can only be a hardening of the Communist line on a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. Therefore, the demonstrations are self-defeating for they postpone the day when a peaceful settlement can be reached. Beyond that they condemn the United States to extended involvement in Vietnam with subsequent loss of American lives. It should be clear by now that those who really want peace in Vietnam are supporting the policies of President Johnson. The harmful effects of these demonstrations have been vividly pointed out in an article by James Reston in the New York Times of Sunday, October 17. In order to bring this fine statement to the attention of my

colleagues I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Chap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western world about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that Commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950 and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government

At this time I wish to commend the committee for having obtained the views of the Comptroller General in respect to a policy matter which I am sure is of vital interest to the Comptroller General.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his usual objective analysis of reports and constructive help on legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1004 as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WONDERFUL YEAR FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, now that the first session of the 89th Congress is about to adjourn, I would like to commend you and my colleagues for a job well done. In all my years of service in the Congress of the United States, I can truthfully say I have never witnessed a more productive session.

As Representatives of the peoples of this wonderful Nation, it is our duty to care for them and to protect them. The legislative proposals that have been passed by the House this year will benefit every man, woman, and child in the city of Philadelphia now and in the future.

During this session of the Congress—month after month—bills have been introduced and passed by the House to improve our Great Society.

For the elderly, this session has provided increased social security benefits; more and better housing, and a fine medical care program.

For our children, we have provided additional educational facilities as well as programs to financially assist worthy students through college.

For the unemployed, programs like the Peace Corps, the Job Corps, and on-the-job training have been enacted.

For our men and women serving in the armed services, bills have been passed by the House to grant them basic pay increases and life insurance coverage.

For our Federal employees, the House of Representatives has approved legislation to grant a much needed pay raise.

For the Federal retirees, the House has approved a bill to grant them increased monthly benefits, which are

sorely needed to meet the present high cost of living.

To stimulate and improve the national economy, the House reduced certain excise taxes in order that you and I—the consumer—may save money.

In addition and of national importance, public works programs have been established to help distressed communities and provide jobs for the unemployed. A law has been placed on the statute books to provide funds for our small businessmen in order that they may continue to compete with big business. Federal moneys have been provided for finer and safer highways, which will create additional jobs.

Water and air pollution control programs have been approved. Our immigration system has been updated and revised. Those entitled to vote have been guaranteed this right. An effective drug control act is now law. Today we have a Commission on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a wonderful year for the American people. We have shown by our deed and our laws that our first concern is for our people and our Nation.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST VIETNAM POLICY

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the past weekend saw demonstrations against American participation in the Vietnam conflict. There were speeches, picketing of draft boards—even burning of draft-cards. I will not attempt to ascertain the causes of these demonstrations, but I would like to read a letter from Capt. Robert Ainsworth, a young Army officer serving in Vietnam. It gives some answers to those who question our presence there:

JULY 6, 1965.

The Reverend HARVEY LORD,
Bozrah Center Congregational Church,
Fitchville, Conn.

DEAR REVEREND LORD: I have just finished reading your letter in the July 5 issue of Newsweek magazine. It was particularly disturbing to me because I felt that as a man of God you, above all, should know the facts before using your title in publicly expressing your views. I am sure you do not realize the impact that a man in your position has on the morale of those who daily risk their lives in the belief that their efforts here are in keeping with the Christian principles of brotherly love and respect for the dignity of man. Your rhetoric as exemplified by the statement "It is a tragedy that the embattled farmers of 1965 are being attacked and bombed by the descendants of the embattled farmers of 1776," was quite clever, but I hope that before you preach your next sermon or write your next article, you will consider some of the pertinent facts about just one of the many advisory teams in this country; one small group of the "descendants of the embattled farmers of 1776."

Our five-man team lives and works in the district of Hoc Mon (similar to a county in the United States), an area approximately 120 square kilometers, and located some 25 kilometers northwest of Saigon. There are more than 120,000 inhabitants living in the 12 villages and 59 hamlets of the Hoc Mon

district. The primary source of income is derived from agriculture, and these people could certainly be considered as the "embattled farmers of 1965." About 30 percent of the total population are Catholics, most of whom are refugees who left their homes and belongings in 1954 and fled to the south.

Except for our small team, there are no American units in the area. The security of our district lies in the hands of a group of 800 volunteers from the villages, who are known as Popular Forces, and are organized into "self-defense" units scattered throughout the district. In the past, these men worked the fields during the day and manned watch-posts at night. Now, because of the Vietcong pressure, they work full-time as security forces while their families work the fields. Their pay is pitiful, their living standards austere, but they never complain. Their courage and sacrifice in trying to maintain those things which we take for granted are an inspiration, to say the least.

But what of those poor unfortunate souls whom you seem to classify with the "embattled farmers of 1965," the Vietcong? In our area there are no Vietcong units as such. This is primarily because they have received no support from the populace. However, just across the canal from our district in a heavily vegetated area, there is a band of Vietcong, about 300 men strong. We have recently received reports that a larger force from North Vietnam has joined forces with this unit. I have seen that face before in my own country—the face of misguided youth enjoying the thrill of a "Robin Hood existence," the hoodlums of the streets raised in an atmosphere of poverty and despair, the men who have decided that working in a rice paddy is drudgery, or that group of disenfranchised men who simply feel that communism is the only way of life and is to be attained at all costs. It is pure folly to pretend that these men are actively engaged in any vocation other than subversion. In the past 30 days some of their "farming" activities included kidnapping five youths fishing for frogs along the canal; throwing a grenade in a marketplace, wounding three people; infiltrating a village on the outer perimeter and executing the young brother of one of the popular forces, and setting off two mines in a residential area, injuring several persons. They are neither selective nor charitable in choosing their victims. A good example you must have read about was the detonating of two mines in a waterfront playground next to My Canh Restaurant in Saigon recently, killing 42 persons of all nationalities and ages.

Last week our popular forces captured 21 suspects who had infiltrated into one of the hamlets during the night. There was no doubt that they were not paying a social call, but they had been careful to hide their weapons, probably burying them in a nearby field. They had to be released for lack of evidence; released to fight another day. Frustrating? Yes, but that's the rule book we are trying to follow, and must follow if we are to win.

I only wish that you could walk through the villages, talk to these people, and get to know them as I do, day after day. I believe that certain facts would become immediately apparent. First, you would be amazed at how knowledgeable and perceptive they are as to their present situation, what they are fighting for and what the Americans are trying to do here. Second, you would find that the American soldier is received with an appreciation unmatched anywhere in the world, including our own country. I am not referring to just the village chiefs and school teachers. I am talking about the man in the rice paddy, walking behind his oxen. Third, you would see that, contrary to all of the publicity that our news media gives to the "glamor" of the battlefield, the majority of our efforts

October 18, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26239

in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will in the end give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the Nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement by the roots and grind it to bits.

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscientious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft dodgers and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent; not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding; but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

THE WATTS MANIFESTO

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, with penetrating insight, Bayard Rustin has written an account of the rioting in the Watts section of Los Angeles. Everyone concerned with the meaning of this explosion will find his article revealing, informative, and moving. It is not a chronology of events. It is, rather, a documentary of emotion and reaction. It could be written only by one who has both a deep understanding of the currents of feeling which generated the rioting and the ability to translate this into articulate thought.

For these reasons I urge that this article be read by my colleagues and by everyone who seeks to understand the relationship between what happened in Watts and what is happening in civil rights across America. "The Watts Manifesto" by Bayard Rustin follows:

[From the New America, Sept. 17, 1965]

THE WATTS "MANIFESTO"

(By Bayard Rustin)

After Dr. King and I went to the Watts area to work with community people to find a creative solution to the conflict and to present demands to the public officials, many sympathetic and troubled white people asked me why Negroes, at a time when they are achieving freedom, would revolt. But to

raise such a question in innocence is almost to answer it.

Too many Americans still do not understand what it means to be a Negro in the United States—not one of the narrow strata of middle class Negroes but what it means to be an "average" Negro. I am talking about the millions of Negroes earning less than what is considered necessary by the U.S. Government to stay above the poverty line, jobless or facing possible joblessness, and stuck at the very bottom of the economic ladder.

According to the State of California, over 30 percent of the Negroes in Watts are unemployed. Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America," puts the figure at closer to 42 percent, because Government figures do not include the thousands who have stopped looking for work after months of fruitless search and those who work part time or only intermittently. For the Negro of Watts and other black ghettos across the land conditions have not improved, they find unemployment deepening and quality integrated schools far from realization.

These are the cold facts behind the flaming ruins in Watts. They remain so even after so many other things have changed as a result of the civil rights revolution. The historic Supreme Court decisions have brought more justice before the law to Negroes particularly in the South. President Johnson has spoken out as no President has ever spoken in our history in his Howard University speech and "We Shall Overcome" address on the eve of the march on Selma, Ala. But the new civil rights legislation passed by Congress, except for the FEPC section of the 1965 civil rights bill, which did not go into operation until this July, did not have any effect on the North. Even the antipoverty program and the social welfare measures, while ameliorating some of the misery, have not yet frontally attacked the basic economic problems.

NOT UNDERSTOOD

What these economic facts mean in human terms is still not understood because they are not experienced by the observer. How else would it be possible that a writer as knowledgeable and perceptive as Walter Lippmann, after pondering the implications of the Watts riots and acknowledging America's failure "to make free men of the great mass of the descendants of the emancipated slaves" could conclude:

"The young rioters are very close to being past saving, and we have to face the grim question of how they can be induced to remain quiet while the necessary reforms for the benefit of other Negroes are worked out in the slow process of political democracy * * *"

The riots themselves refute Lippmann's conclusions.

One of the first lessons of Watts is that Negro ghetto youths cannot be "induced to remain quiet." When I talked to young people in Watts many of them referred to their "manifesto." I asked a young girl what they meant by the "manifesto." Who wrote it? She said, "We wrote it." When I asked to see a copy she burst into laughter and said, "Daddy, we're not talking about nothing you write, we're talking about the blood. We're talking about the fires. That's our manifesto. Now, you write something, you don't know who's to read it. But, baby, all over the world they know about our manifesto cause we wrote it in blood."

Another young boy said to me, "What we are trying to teach those white folks is to render to Caesar what is his, but give us what's ours."

If we can't read their "manifesto" in the burnt buildings and the smashed store windows in Watts, if things don't change, these young people were saying they would do it

again. They wanted more than anything to be heard, to be recognized, to be listened to. At a meeting that Dr. King and I attended, a young man got up and said, "Dr. King we're happy, you've come, but you're not what we really want to hear. You go tell the Governor and the mayor to come down here and hear our grievances, and tell the goddamned chief of police we want to talk to him and tell them what's been happening down here." But too many people are still not listening.

DIGNITY

A second point is that these desperate youth cannot be bought off with the dole. They want jobs, decent houses and, above all, dignity. A dramatic illustration of their great hunger for pride and dignity occurred when the city authorities brought food into Watts. Many food stores had been destroyed and others remained closed. There was nowhere to buy food and many residents who had been kept away from work did not have any money even should food have been available for purchase.

But when the relief groups came in and started throwing bread and other food off trucks to the crowds in the street, the people refused to pick the food up. They said, "Man, don't treat us like that, we don't want your goddamn food." Hungry men, some of whom had not eaten for days, refused the food.

When the authorities turned the distribution over to more sensitive community volunteers, the people took the food. But they still refused to take the milk unless it came out of glasses, bottles, or cartons. They would not take it out of cans. They refused to take bread and other staples that were not properly wrapped.

And all this reveals to me that there is something far greater than hunger and that is the hunger for dignity. And when that basic human desire for dignity is frustrated, when hopes are smashed as they have been for the masses of Negroes, their desires are channeled into a destructive direction.

A young boy, who had been involved in a number of situations of arson, told me that he enjoyed it. "You mean you enjoyed seeing buildings going up in fire?" I asked. "I did," he replied, "because it gave me a feeling of being powerful, of being somebody. And if I can't go downtown and be a man, at least up here I can set something on fire." These youths, blocked from asserting their manhood in constructive ways, turn to violence. And this is a society in which violence has come to be related to manhood.

Mr. Lippmann should recognize that these young people cannot be bought off with relief checks or bread lines. This generation of ghetto youth will not accept being consigned to the American scrap heap as past generations have been. They have peered over the ghetto wall, they watch television and they have observed America's affluence. They want what most other young Americans have—a decent life, and an opportunity to better their existence—things that all America's children deserve.

HOPES

The families of these young people came to Watts seeking these opportunities. Over half of the inhabitants of Watts have come from the South over the past 25 years. The attraction was not the relief doles as some would have it. They came to California mainly during the Second and Korean wars, seeking jobs in the burgeoning defense industry and an expanding economy. They are still pouring into Watts as more Negroes are being displaced in Southern agriculture by machines. Like the European immigrants they were fleeing from misery and oppression. They came with many of the same kinds of hopes and illusions about "the gold in the pay envelopes."

But the difference is that today unskilled and uneducated hands are no longer needed to tend automated production. Their hopes were dashed. They hear speeches about the new opportunities opening up for Negroes but there are no jobs to fulfill their expectations. The result is resentment and bitterness.

TURN TO NATIONALISM

When no aid seemed forthcoming from outside the ghettos to help them to constructively and creatively tear down the walls that imprison them, they tried to burn them down. Feeling alone and unwanted they are turning to black nationalism.

I don't mean that they join the Muslims of Black Nationalists, only a small number do this. They develop a kind of nationalistic pride. They cannot identify with America, because this conception only emphasizes the lowliness of their position as compared to other Americans. Many of them identify psychologically with the new African nations where black men are assuming the positions of leadership and dignity that have been denied Negro Americans. Thus their skin color becomes transformed into a badge of honor rather than one of shame.

It is so surprising that people deprived of the economic and social necessities for dignity find that the only things they have to take pride in, are the color of their skin and their hatred? It is a similar phenomenon to what occurs in the thinking of the whites in Mississippi. But this is a sicker form of race pride because it can only be maintained through constant acts of oppression. The "poor white trash" also turn to violence—they have for more than a century—to maintain a feeling of worth and dignity. And I saw this craving for dignity, for nationalistic pride among the youth and adults in Watts in a much stronger form than I ever saw before. As a response to the hostility and indifference they felt from the white world, the black people of Watts grew closer together. It was common to see children, young people, and often adults, exchange a new kind of greeting: one puts his thumb over his little finger, holds out the three middle fingers, and says "brother."

Paradoxically the communal bonds had grown stronger during and after the riots. The strangeness and loneliness which are the experience of those who have newly entered the northern ghettos from the South, gave way to a feeling of community and relatedness. Many responded to this much more than to the violence. The fraternity of combatants—that is one of the few admirable qualities of war.

Ironically for all those who advocate that Negroes should band together like other national groups—the Italians, Jews, and Irish—for self-help programs, this was precisely what happened. But the organizations and programs were much more extreme because the problems were more extreme.

In Watts these relationships were developed on a class basis perhaps even more than on a racial basis. This is natural because the problem of the Negro in America is one of class as well as race. The majority of Negroes, together with the white poor—separate but equal—make up what Gunnar Myrdal has so aptly called, the American "underclass."

During the riots there was almost as much hatred and bitterness toward the Negro middle class "who had made it" as toward the whites. An illustration of this occurred at a meeting held shortly after the riots. It was proposed that all the community and civil rights leaders join together to present their demands to the authorities. This was refused by those local leaders—block and gang leaders, heads of nationalist sects and the others most closely related to the poor. In private they said if they joined with the civil rights groups, churchmen, and middle-

class community leaders they would be rejected by their people and replaced by extremists.

Here the civil rights movement is faced with profound difficulties. Divisions are growing wider in the Negro community as new opportunities open up to the middle class as a result of progress in social integration but the great masses of Negroes remain economically segregated and impoverished.

The civil rights movement must develop an effective economic program that responds to this problem in order to bridge the gulf emerging between the Negro leadership at the grass roots and the national level. The major civil rights organizations, from SNCC to the Urban League, have not moved fast enough toward developing and pressing for necessary programs although stronger efforts are now being made in this direction. And too often, also, the grass-roots leadership has offered only nationalistic slogans to solve complicated economic and social problems.

But, essentially this is not the fault of the Negro leadership. Negro poverty and unemployment is built into our present economic structure. It will require a major national effort to redirect and transform our economic and political institutions to resolve the basic conflict.

In this kind of a situation, one should think carefully before concluding, as Mr. Lippman does, about how "the young rioters are close to being past saving." This kind of attitude in itself could be considered an "incitement to riot" by those being cast out of our society, by those who in fact have never been given the opportunity to enter it.

In one sense the criminals in the Negro community can be compared to the youth who rioted—but certainly not in the way the chief of police made this comparison. Springing from the poor, the uneducated, and the unskilled, many of the criminal types are among those most able at surviving the harsh rigors of the ghetto. Neither the Negro criminals nor the rioting youth are simple phenomena to be dealt with or dismissed easily.

The response to Government training and job programs is amazing. Many more young Negroes turned up to apply for these OEO projects than the openings provided for. If American society cannot offer a decent and humane solution to the awesome problems of the Negro youth then it is our society that is hopeless and not these young people.

COMMUNITY INVOLVED

It should be clear that what we are dealing with here is the problems of the entire Negro community, not just the criminal elements, delinquent adolescents, and the hopelessly disintegrated. The riots were a warning and an appeal, not from the narrow section of the Watts community, but from the masses of Negroes.

I could not count heads but reports I have received and my experiences with the people leads me to believe that a large percentage of the people living in the Watts area participated. Most of them did not themselves loot and burn but they were on the streets at one time or other. The idea that most of the people caught up in the rioting were criminals, as Chief Parker would have it, is belied even by the type of looting that took place. Most of the people involved were stealing things they thought they would never otherwise have, and a great number of touching stories can be told of this. There was a husband and wife, both over 60, carrying a couch about 8 blocks to their home. They got so tired with this enormous couch that they just plopped down in the middle of the street and rested on the couch until they could carry it further. These were hardly criminal types—they were people caught in a kind of carnival atmosphere of stealing.

A large number of people were arrested trying to match up furniture. One of them was a woman who had gone out with her children to get a kitchen set. But when she got home she added up and discovered that they needed another chair in order to feed the whole family around the table. They went back to get the additional chair and they all got arrested. There was an amusing, tragically amusing, side to the manner in which people who are not used to theft can get caught up in a mob situation where these things are going on. And the greatest number of arrests were for looting, not arson or shooting.

As a person who deplores violence I want to say something that may sound shocking if it is not carefully understood. The violence in the Watts area was a relatively healthy reaction to the situation. The conditions in the Negro ghetto generate enormous amounts of violence, but heretofore it has almost always been Negroes who have suffered from that violence and were its victims.

Frustrated black men beat up their women and abused their children, they knifed other black men in barroom brawls. The number of murders last year in Watts was extraordinarily high. It is well known that the police care little and do little about the violence Negroes inflict on each other. But this time Negro violence was expressed outwardly toward hated objects, belonging to the white world. Psychologists would say this was a healthier expression of anger than the usual self-destruction. Even so, more Negroes than whites were killed.

But in a sense, Negroes were willing to pay this price. In some families Negro men who had participated in the riots were treated with awe and respect by the wives and children. They were no longer the passive victims of the ghetto, to be either pitied or hated, often both, by their families. Now they were—if even for a moment—men who had asserted themselves through action. A jobless young man of eighteen who already had a number of common law marriages and six children by different women, told me that the first time he felt like a man was when he saw the building he set on fire, burn to the ground.

Family counseling and psychotherapy can't solve the Negro family problem. These can only help in some cases and under certain conditions. But without a program that provides jobs at decent wages counseling and therapy are impotent. It should be clear that we can't solve the Negro family problem without solving the unemployment problem.

I have described the feelings and attitudes of the people who rioted—the nationalism, the anger, the class and economic nature of the problem. All of these factors were reflected in the events. Now I want to describe the riots. The events almost speak for themselves and they refute two theories presented about the riots. The riots were neither a plot nor a totally irrational outburst of madness, although there were many irrational aspects.

While a ghetto riot doesn't have a head it does roll on with a kind of logic. Violence was not indiscriminate in Watts. Where Negro storekeepers put up signs, "I am a poor working Negro trying to make a business," they were not touched. Where a sign said "blood brother" the mobs passed it by. Even where there were white-owned businesses which had given the community people a break—allowed them credit or purchases on time, even at relatively high prices some stores were spared. But where merchants were known to be gougers they were looted and destroyed.

That the direction the rioters took was not entirely antisocial is demonstrated by their treatment of the liquor stores. All the liquor stores were broken into and burned. But I was told by a number of reliable ob-

credit by the skin of my teeth, but only after taking the regular rise in interest costs which occurred at that time and an additional cost of 25 percent penalty. Some other small companies were squeezed out completely. During this same period, we had much less trouble from small banks. Small banks have no choice, they must, in but exceptional cases, do business with smaller companies and people.

Every bank merger eliminates at least one bank from the banking industry. Every time that a bank is eliminated the public has one less bank to which it can present a loan request. This does not affect large corporations, but for smaller businesses and individuals, it may mean the difference between obtaining a loan on the one hand and going under on the other hand.

S. 1698 should be defeated.

Congress should not, however, stop there. It should also repeal the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, the sponsor of S. 1698, has stated: "The decisions of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases imposed on bank mergers the strict standards of section 7 of the Clayton Act and what apparently have become the equally strict standards of the Sherman Act. Clearly, these decisions have changed the situation on which the Bank Merger Act was based. If these cases had been decided before 1959, the Bank Merger Act would have been considered unnecessary."

Now that those cases have been decided, the Bank Merger Act of 1960 is as unnecessary today as it would have been in 1960 had those cases been decided before 1959.

Bank mergers should be measured by the same standards that mergers in other industries are measured by. It should be left to the Justice Department to determine initially whether a bank merger violates the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act and, upon the institution of suit by the Justice Department, to enjoin a bank merger or to divest banks which have already merged, it should be left to the Federal courts to decide whether the merger should be permitted or prohibited. Let the banking supervisory agencies regulate in those areas in which they are well equipped to regulate. But if competition is to be preserved and the public interest protected, do not give them the authority to permit banks to merge.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WATER CONSERVATION

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, in our land of abundance, it seems strange that customers in New York restaurants are not served water unless they ask for it.

This brings home to all of us, however, the need for conservation of our natural resources.

We are now taking two important steps: we are going to clean up this Nation's polluted streams, and we are going to make desalting feasible.

A recent article in the Sharon, Pa., Herald, hails these advances and notes the President's admonition that "aggressive conservation measures" are needed

and must be taken. Because the editorial will be of general interest, I insert it in the Record:

WATER CONSERVATION EFFORTS: WASHINGTON TAKES A HAND

The hearings on Hudson River pollution which opened Tuesday emphasize the increasingly active role of the Federal Government in water policy. U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner in announcing the hearings called the fouling of the Hudson "a shocking example of the destruction of resources that are vital to the health and welfare of our people." The U.S. Public Health Service said that the river now carries pollution from the equivalent of 10 million people.

The Federal Government's growing water role is largely a matter of lack of local responsibility and inability of States and localities to settle their differences over water use. By historical accident, great river systems of the continental United States are boundaries between various States, between the United States and Mexico, and in part between the United States and Canada. These rivers are thus subject to Federal jurisdiction, in whole or in part, under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The Potomac River Basin, for example, runs into four States. Federal, State, and local officials are now working together toward a plan for rescuing the river from pollution and siltation. The planners, incidentally, oppose major reservoirs proposed by the Army Engineers, but encourage development of a network of small headwater impoundments.

The recent drought may prove to be not an unmixed disaster. For one thing, it gave urgency to the search for a cheap way to desalt water. Congress completed action last month on a bill to enlarge and extend the saline water program through fiscal 1972. President Johnson at the same time told Federal officials concerned with the research to proceed "as if you knew that you were going to run out of drinking water in the next 6 months."

The drought also made cooperation among States, localities, and the Federal Government more urgent. Congress took a modest step recently toward formulating a national water policy. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, approved by the President in July, gave statutory authority to the existing ad hoc water resources council created by President Kennedy 4 years ago.

President Johnson has outlined an emergency water program for the New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania area. This effort will not provide a permanent solution to the problems of the Delaware and Hudson basins, of course; to succeed at all it must be accompanied, the President said, by "aggressive conservation measures."

VIETNAM: THE DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam which were held in several cities across our country this last weekend, including my own district in California, have generated feelings ranging from fervent support to outright hostility. They have stirred many comments and raised many questions. But let us take a minute to put the issue in perspective.

The right of protest, dissent, and free speech is, of course, a tradition of our society and a guarantee of our Constitution. Of no less importance is our tra-

ditional respect for and our reliance on a system of law and order. It seems almost needless to say, but perhaps it bears repeating at this time, that both have contributed to make our country what it is today; that neither can be compromised at the expense of the other; that both must be respected and sustained.

The war in Vietnam is most certainly a vital national issue. It both deserves and demands public thought and comment. But if this comment and participation is to be constructive it must be conducted in a lawful and a responsible manner. The very values of our form of government and our way of life require no less.

In commenting on the demonstrations, the Washington Post quite correctly stated this morning:

That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety.

But, the terrible irony of the demonstrations this last week is, as the distinguished columnist and associate editor of the New York Times—Mr. James Reston—pointed out yesterday:

They (the demonstrators) are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they most fear. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it.

The awful paradox, as Mr. Reston goes on, is that—

The Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Or as the Washington Post stated it:

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. * * * The demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong.

For the record is quite clear that Hanoi and the Vietcong, despite the American military buildup which has blunted their long-expected monsoon offensive and despite a very recent and intensive 10-week diplomatic effort on our part, have evidenced no interest at all in reducing the fighting or coming to the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Reston's thoughtful article along with the Washington Post's timely comment for the careful consideration of our colleagues and all other concerned Americans.

I would also like to take this opportunity once again to state my belief that the United States measured response is the only reasonable alternative to Communist aggression and terror and subversion in Vietnam. I would like to state my strong and continued support for negotiations which can end the war and insure the people of South Vietnam self-

determination under United Nations guarantees at the earliest possible time. And I would like to urge, despite the Communist's continued intransigence and the apparent turning of the military tide, that we continue to mount the diplomatic offensive which is absolutely essential in peace is to be secured, independent choice guaranteed and the great task of building and rebuilding begun.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western world about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950

and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will in the end give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscientious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft-dodgers, and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent, not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

THE DEMONSTRATORS

The meaning of the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam will be understood in this country. The pressure groups mobilized by the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam are familiar here. All the expected elements were included, from Communists whose purpose is to destroy this country to earnest pacifists motivated by patriotic impulses.

The demonstrations revealed what the polls have long shown, that the determined popular opposition to the policy of the Government of the United States in South Vietnam has diminished to that irreducible dissenting minimum inevitable in a democratic society. That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety. The police, in most cities, seem to have dealt with the demonstrators and spectators with commendable restraint and patience and success. It is gratifying to know that we live in a country where the smallest minorities are free to disclose sentiments against the policies of the Government.

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this

country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. The National Liberation Front, for many long months, has been counting on public opinion in the United States to accomplish what it has been unable to achieve by armed force. Its officials have been sustained by the belief that American public opinion will do for them what French public opinion did for the Vietminh. They are bound to see the straggling marchers, the ineffectual protest meetings, and the feeble demonstrations through prisms made out of their own narrow and restricted experience. They imagine that the United States is governed by a ruling elite or clique ruling as precariously as did Diem or the colonial puppets of France. And they fancy that such a government can be toppled by a handful of pickets and marchers.

So the demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong. The Communists who marched on Saturday, of course, will be delighted to have this happen. But it must be confusing to the liberals and real pacifists who sincerely desire the end of the war to realize that demonstrations such as theirs are the chief hope of the National Liberation Front for prolonging the war. It probably will take a few more months of fighting than it otherwise would have taken to bring the NLF to the conference table. This cannot be what most of the unsophisticated young people wish to accomplish.

VIETNAM PROTESTS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read in the paper this morning that President Johnson's pastor, the Reverend Dr. George R. Davis, in his sermon yesterday, strongly criticized Saturday's demonstrations in protest to the United States helping defend South Vietnam.

I am sure that most Americans, although they must defend the right of petition and peaceful assembly, will agree with Dr. Davis, or will at least consider these demonstrators as doing a great disservice to the cause of freedom. Meanwhile, as Dr. Davis pointed out, to uphold democracy, some free Nation has got to stand—as he said—at the ram-parts.

Speaking as a Republican who supports the administration's policy, I abhor war—as does everyone else—but right now, we must put freedom first. I think that military assistance to South Vietnam is the shortest way and the best hope of lasting world peace.

THE COMMUNISTS GAIN: FREEDOM LOSES IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC— ANOTHER LAOS IN THE MAKING?

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, many Latin American editors meeting in San Diego apparently confirmed what I have been saying for some time about the results of the United States yielding to Communist demands after military intervention in the Dominican Republic, that is, that the strength of the Commu-

determination under United Nations guarantees at the earliest possible time. And I would like to urge, despite the Communist's continued intransigence and the apparent turning of the military tide, that we continue to mount the diplomatic offensive which is absolutely essential in peace is to be secured, independent choice guaranteed and the great task of building and rebuilding begun.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF

INTELLIGENCE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western world about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950

and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since mid-summer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will in the end give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft-dodgers, and rent-a-crown bores who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent, not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1965]

THE DEMONSTRATORS

The meaning of the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam will be understood in this country. The pressure groups mobilized by the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam are familiar here. All the expected elements were included, from Communists whose purpose is to destroy this country to earnest pacifists motivated by patriotic impulses.

The demonstrations revealed what the polls have long shown, that the determined popular opposition to the policy of the Government of the United States in South Vietnam has diminished to that irreducible dissenting minimum inevitable in a democratic society. That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety. The police, in most cities, seem to have dealt with the demonstrators and spectators with commendable restraint and patience and success. It is gratifying to know that we live in a country where the smallest minorities are free to disclose sentiments against the policies of the Government.

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this

country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. The National Liberation Front, which has been counting on public opinion in the United States to accomplish what it has been unable to achieve by armed force. Its officials have been sustained by the belief that American public opinion will do for them what French public opinion did for the Vietminh. They are bound to see the straggling marchers, the ineffectual protest meetings, and the feeble demonstrations through prisms made out of their own narrow and restricted experience. They imagine that the United States is governed by a ruling elite or clique ruling as precariously as did Diem or the colonial puppets of France. And they fancy that such a government can be toppled by a handful of pickets and marchers.

So the demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong. The Communists who marched on Saturday, of course, will be delighted to have this happen. But it must be confusing to the liberals and real pacifists who sincerely desire the end of the war to realize that demonstrations such as theirs are the chief hope of the National Liberation Front for prolonging the war. It probably will take a few more months of fighting than it otherwise would have taken to bring the NLF to the conference table. This cannot be what most of the unsophisticated young people wish to accomplish.

VIETNAM PROTESTS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read in the paper this morning that President Johnson's pastor, the Reverend Dr. George R. Davis, in his sermon yesterday, strongly criticized Saturday's demonstrations in protest to the United States helping defend South Vietnam.

I am sure that most Americans, although they must defend the right of petition and peaceful assembly, will agree with Dr. Davis, or will at least consider these demonstrators as doing a great disservice to the cause of freedom. Meanwhile, as Dr. Davis pointed out, to uphold democracy, some free Nation has got to stand—as he said—at the ramparts.

Speaking as a Republican who supports the administration's policy, I abhor war—as does everyone else—but right now, we must put freedom first. I think that military assistance to South Vietnam is the shortest way and the best hope of lasting world peace.

THE COMMUNISTS GAIN: FREEDOM LOSES IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—ANOTHER LAOS IN THE MAKING?

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, many Latin American editors meeting in San Diego apparently confirmed what I have been saying for some time about the results of the United States yielding to Communist demands after military intervention in the Dominican Republic, that is, that the strength of the Commu-

credit by the skin of my teeth, but only after taking the regular rise in interest costs which occurred at that time and an additional cost of 35 percent penalty. Some other small companies were squeezed out completely. During this same period, we had much less trouble from small banks. Small banks have no choice, they must, in but exceptional cases, do business with smaller companies and people.

Every bank merger eliminates at least one bank from the banking industry. Every time that a bank is eliminated the public has one less bank to which it can present a loan request. This does not affect large corporations, but for smaller businesses and individuals, it may mean the difference between obtaining a loan on the one hand and going under on the other hand.

S. 1998 should be defeated.

Congress should not, however, stop there. It should also repeal the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Senator A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, the sponsor of S. 1998, has stated: "The decisions of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases imposed on bank mergers the strict standards of section 7 of the Clayton Act and what apparently have become the equally strict standards of the Sherman Act. Clearly, these decisions have changed the situation on which the Bank Merger Act was based. If these cases had been decided before 1960, the Bank Merger Act would have been considered unnecessary."

Now that those cases have been decided, the Bank Merger Act of 1960 is as unnecessary today as it would have been in 1960 had those cases been decided before 1960.

Bank mergers should be measured by the same standards that mergers in other industries are measured by. It should be left to the Justice Department to determine initially whether a bank merger violates the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act and, upon the institution of suit by the Justice Department, to enjoin a bank merger or to divest banks which have already merged, it should be left to the Federal courts to decide whether the merger should be permitted or prohibited. Let the banking supervisory agencies regulate in those areas in which they are well equipped to regulate. But if competition is to be preserved and the public interest protected, do not give them the authority to permit banks to merge.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WATER CONSERVATION

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, in our land of abundance, it seems strange that customers in New York restaurants are not served water unless they ask for it.

This brings home to all of us, however, the need for conservation of our natural resources.

We are now taking two important steps: we are going to clean up this Nation's polluted streams, and we are going to make desalting feasible.

A recent article in the Sharon, Pa., Herald, hails these advances and notes the President's admonition that "aggressive conservation measures" are needed

and must be taken. Because the editorial will be of general interest, I insert it in Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300140006-8

WATER CONSERVATION EFFORTS: WASHINGTON TAKES A HAND

The hearings on Hudson River pollution which opened Tuesday emphasize the increasingly active role of the Federal Government in water policy. U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner in announcing the hearings called the fouling of the Hudson "a shocking example of the destruction of resources that are vital to the health and welfare of our people." The U.S. Public Health Service said that the river now carries pollution from the equivalent of 10 million people.

The Federal Government's growing water role is largely a matter of lack of local responsibility and inability of States and localities to settle their differences over water use. By historical accident, great river systems of the continental United States are boundaries between various States, between the United States and Mexico, and in part between the United States and Canada. These rivers are thus subject to Federal jurisdiction, in whole or in part, under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The Potomac River Basin, for example, runs into four States. Federal, State, and local officials are now working together toward a plan for rescuing the river from pollution and siltation. The planners, incidentally, oppose major reservoirs proposed by the Army Engineers, but encourage development of a network of small headwater impoundments.

The recent drought may prove to be not an unmixed disaster. For one thing, it gave urgency to the search for a cheap way to desalt water. Congress completed action last month on a bill to enlarge and extend the saline water program through fiscal 1972. President Johnson at the same time told Federal officials concerned with the research to proceed "as if you knew that you were going to run out of drinking water in the next 6 months."

The drought also made cooperation among States, localities, and the Federal Government more urgent. Congress took a modest step recently toward formulating a national water policy. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1966, approved by the President in July, gave statutory authority to the existing ad hoc water resources council created by President Kennedy 4 years ago.

President Johnson has outlined an emergency water program for the New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania area. This effort will not provide a permanent solution to the problems of the Delaware and Hudson basins, of course; to succeed at all it must be accompanied, the President said, by "aggressive conservation measures."

VIETNAM: THE DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam which were held in several cities across our country this last weekend, including my own district in California, have generated feelings ranging from fervent support to outright hostility. They have stirred many comments and raised many questions. But let us take a minute to put the issue in perspective.

The right of protest, dissent, and free speech is, of course, a tradition of our society and a guarantee of our Constitution. Of no less importance is our tra-

ditional respect for and our reliance on a system of law and order. It seems almost needless to say, but perhaps it bears repeating at this time, that both have contributed to make our country what it is today; that neither can be compromised at the expense of the other; that both must be respected and sustained.

The war in Vietnam is most certainly a vital national issue. It both deserves and demands public thought and comment. But if this comment and participation is to be constructive it must be conducted in a lawful and a responsible manner. The very values of our form of government and our way of life require no less.

In commenting on the demonstrations, the Washington Post quite correctly stated this morning:

That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety.

But, the terrible irony of the demonstrations this last week is, as the distinguished columnist and associate editor of the New York Times—Mr. James Reston—pointed out yesterday:

They (the demonstrators) are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they most fear. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it.

The awful paradox, as Mr. Reston goes on, is that—

The Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Or as the Washington Post stated it:

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. * * * The demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong.

For the record is quite clear that Hanoi and the Vietcong, despite the American military buildup which has blunted their long-expected monsoon offensive and despite a very recent and intensive 10-week diplomatic effort on our part, have evidenced no interest at all in reducing the fighting or coming to the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Reston's thoughtful article along with the Washington Post's timely comment for the careful consideration of our colleagues and all other concerned Americans.

I would also like to take this opportunity once again to state my belief that the United States measured response is the only reasonable alternative to Communist aggression and terror and subversion in Vietnam. I would like to state my strong and continued support for negotiations which can end the war and insure the people of South Vietnam self-

er 18, 1965

is that many more bottles of liquor destroyed than were stolen to be drunk. I think this happened because although on the one hand the people needed liquor to make their lives bearable, they revolted against the idea that they have to live on it. I think they demonstrated a kind of logic by which people turn against the things that destroy them.

No simple-minded conclusions that the riots were instigated by "malcontents or subversives" fit the facts. From information I got from trusted observers and participants, and from my own personal experience during the Harlem riots, the two events follow a similar pattern.

First, both were spontaneous, sparked by an incident involving the police. Second, as the situation began to get out of hand the police became frightened and used excessive violence. More people joined the rioters and then criminal gangs took over, looted and encouraged others to loot, sometimes justifying the action with civil rights and nationalistic arguments. And lastly, some political elements tried to take advantage of the situation by making themselves visible through leaflets and speeches to the crowds.

Of course there was much that was irrational in the riots. But the irrationality of people forced by society to live in insane conditions is far different from the irrationality of the police chief and mayor of Los Angeles. They denounced the Negro leadership, and refused to meet with them early enough. It was the mayor who acted irresponsibly by contributing to blocking the poverty program. He had attempted to control it to strengthen his own political machine by excluding other political factions and representatives from the Negro community. As a result, Los Angeles was one of the few cities in the United States that had no poverty program, and this made the situation even more desperate.

The mayor and the chief of police, by their statements and actions before and during the riots, put the community leaders in an untenable position, limiting their influence over the rioters and preventing them from turning the violence into constructive protest action. The rioters' response to the appeals of the Negro leadership was that only one thing could affect the mayor and the police chief—violence. And I must say that Parker and Yorty are themselves convincing arguments that the people on the street were right. But, as I pointed out earlier, the situation was one in which, even if these public officials had been angels, it is doubtful that violence could have been wholly averted.

HARLEM AND WATTS COMPARED

During the Harlem riots we urged rioters to stop the violence and organize nonviolent protest, but we met with very slight success. This is understandable, because when we tell them to go home, they feel we are asking them to accept the conditions of their lives. Dr. King and I were not surprised when we were booed in Watts.

The situation in Watts was more difficult than in Harlem for a number of reasons. Time had passed and the situation for the ghetto Negro had not improved. A number of gangs existed whose activities, though mainly petty crime and violence, had begun to develop a nationalistic strain. The fact that Dick Gregory was shot when he tried to calm the crowd was an indication that the situation had gotten worse.

I have witnessed a number of riots and there is another important difference between past riots and the explosion in Watts. Almost all of these other riots turned back toward some programmatic aspect of the civil rights struggle.

I remember the Harlem riot in 1942 which started out as a protest against the OPA's not watching and controlling prices in

Harlem. It ended with the destruction of A. Philip Randolph's march on Washington office. The crowd was saying, "Randolph, why don't you march?" A short time before, Mr. Randolph had planned to march unless President Roosevelt established a Fair Employment Practices Commission. Roosevelt gave in to the pressure and the march was called off. But the Negro community wanted to go further.

The situation subsequently improved. At the time war production was expanding rapidly and there were soon jobs for Negroes in the full employment war economy. Today the job situation is much worse, and while there were still programmatic aspects to the riots in Watts recently, and in Harlem last summer, the ideological basis this time was predominantly nationalistic and narrow in its implications. The rioters were saying, "You white folks won't help us and we black people in the ghetto will have to do it ourselves. If we can't have what you have we're going to destroy what you have. We are going to turn this country upside down." There was a stronger element of despair than ever before.

The heightened aspirations and expectations inspired by the civil rights revolution have not been fulfilled for the masses of Negroes. And as a result, not only was the extent of violence and destruction greater than in Harlem last summer but the psychological attitude of the rioters was different. In Harlem the youth and adults on the streets screamed at the police, "You want to kill a nigger? kill me." But in Watts, the cry of the crowd was "burn baby, burn."

TAX SHARING

(Mr. TODD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, tax sharing between Federal and local governmental units was suggested in 1961 as a means of meeting the increasing needs of State and local governments by the then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Prof. Walter Heller. More recently, it was the subject of a study by a special task force headed by Dr. Joseph Peckman, director of economics at the Brookings Institution. The details of this study have not yet been released. The principle of tax sharing has recently been endorsed by a number of Governors at their conference. In my opinion, this proposal has a great deal of merit and should be considered by the Congress in its next session. It has much to recommend it:

Those of us who are familiar with millage battles at home know how hard it is to raise the funds needed for our local school systems and how the millage is never voted until 2 or 3 years after the crisis has occurred. We know of the person living on a fixed income or annuity whose increased property tax comes out of their food allowance and who justifiably complains that property taxes can go no higher. We know of the businessman who may be taxed 5 percent on his inventory, even though he may be in a business, such as food sales, in which he realizes a profit of only 1 or 2 percent on his inventory. We know of the farmer who doesn't buy a machine he needs or cannot store his grain on his farm because the property tax is too high. We know that property taxes, which provide

37 percent of the State and local revenues, cannot substantially be increased.

In States such as my own, the sales tax is already at its upper limit, and might even appropriately be reduced on certain necessities of life. In addition, a variety of other taxes—business activities, nuisance and intangibles provide a hodge-podge of revenues which cannot be expanded without driving business into other States. City and State income taxes, if in existence, cannot readily be extended without tending to drive businesses and citizens into other cities and States where these taxes do not exist.

One of the communities in my district, at this very moment, is deciding on whether or not to impose a city income tax. This city has a problem shared by many of this Nation's smaller and larger communities alike—it is a core city, surrounded by residential and light industrial city and township governments. The core city is expected to provide most of the needs of the entire metropolitan area, with only a portion of the metropolitan tax base within its borders. In addition, it is being asked to provide social and welfare services which benefit the surrounding communities, without their substantial financial involvement.

Some say a city income tax appears to provide a means of securing the needed revenue—but will it, in fact, do so? If a city income tax is imposed, will industry settle and expand within the city or instead move outside the city—either near or far away—to avoid the tax? Certainly the presence of the tax will tend to keep out potential new industries. Will industries already in the city prefer discontinuing their operations by shifting them to other plants in other parts of the country? Certainly they must seriously consider doing so, for if they are selling in competitive markets, without Government subsidies, they cannot absorb the city income tax increases if their competitors in other cities do not have the same increases imposed on them.

This city, like many others in our land, must face the hard decision: whether to impose a new tax to increase revenue to pay for needed services and thereby take the substantial risk of driving industries and citizens away or to neglect the needs of the community and leave taxes at their present levels. Both courses of action are, in a very real sense, self-defeating. There is no obviously preferable course.

In short, local units of government are going to have a hard time expanding their sources of revenue. Although tax revision and reform may be undertaken by the more courageous State legislatures, it will not necessarily entail a needed expansion in State revenues, because States and their tax structure still remain in competition with each other.

It is also obvious that the needs of State and local governments will grow rapidly. During the period 1953 to 1963, State and local governments increased their expenditures by 132 percent. Their expenditure on education increased by 155 percent to a total of \$24 billion. Their expenditures on public welfare, and on health and hospitals doubled. It is expected that State and local expendi-

October 18, 1965

tures must rise at a rate of at least 7 percent a year if they are to satisfy local needs.

If we make the bold assertion that State and local revenues from existing taxes grow as fast as the national product—5 percent per year—there will still be a gap of 2 percent between their revenue and their expenditures. This will be of a magnitude of \$2 to \$3 billion per year by 1970.

If we look ahead, then, the options are clear: States and local governments will have to increase the types of taxes which are already at their upper limit; or they will have to receive Federal grants in aid for specific programs; or they will fall to meet service needs of their communities; or they will have to receive a share of Federal tax revenues. Of all these options, the last is clearly the most acceptable.

It is estimated by a number of students on the subject that Federal tax revenues will continue to grow at a rate of \$4 to \$7 billion per year. In the absence of an armed conflict—which will severely tighten our belts—we can anticipate the possibility of further tax reductions, further increases in Federal nondefense programs, and/or a reallocation of some of this growing Federal revenue to the States and communities. I would favor a combination of tax reduction and of tax sharing with the local units of government.

I am, accordingly, introducing today a bill which provides a mechanism of sharing Federal tax revenues with the States and local units of government. In many respects, this bill is similar to S. 2619, introduced on October 11 by Senators JAVITS and HARTKE and to H.R. 11535 in the House introduced by Representative REIP of New York. But it is dissimilar in that it shares tax revenues with the States without tying strings on fund use. Whereas the Senate bill says that the funds must be used only for purposes of health, education, and welfare, I prefer to allow the local governmental units to use the funds in any manner they desire, except highway construction. I see no wisdom in telling a State, county, city, or village, that they need to spend money on this activity and not that. In fact, they need to spend money on all the activities for which they are held accountable, in the best judgment of their citizens. And I respect the judgment of these citizens, as well as differences of opinion which may exist from one community to another. If we in Congress see other needs—transportation, education, recreation, or conservation—which cannot be met by State action, we can make use of existing programs of grants in aid.

My bill, like the Senate proposal, limits revenue sharing to Federal personal income tax receipts, since these are among the least volatile of Federal revenues.

My bill distributes this shared Federal tax on the basis of a State's population. It makes no provision for adjusting the allocation up or down on the basis of the State's per capita income or its own effort to raise revenues. If we wish to redistribute income further than my bill would do it, I believe we

should use the technique of grants-in-aid, so that we know just what we are doing and how much it is costing. There is enough hidden redistribution going on right now.

I believe this approach is consistent with the proposition that our citizens are best able to determine their needs for themselves, and that governmental decisions should be as decentralized as possible. It accepts the traditional belief that the needs of our citizens for health and education and comfort can best be met at the local level. It will arrest the tendency to transfer some of these responsibilities to the Federal Government just because the local governments do not have funds to provide for them.

Although my bill is merely an early proposal, I hope to discuss its ideas, merits, and imperfections with my constituents during the recess, and to make further contributions to this dialog when Congress reconvenes in January.

The problem is pressing, the need is great. I believe the Congress has a responsibility to seriously consider this and other proposals right away. Our State and local governments are now facing a severe crisis. They are facing demands in the present—particularly with regard to water and air pollution, overcrowded and substandard schools, insufficient recreation facilities, and even inadequate health care. But their sources of revenue are years out of date and available taxes have been pushed about as high as they can go.

I believe the bill will help strengthen the capacity of local governments to serve their citizens more effectively and more responsibly.

RED COMMUNISTS INSTIGATE PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the peace demonstrations and riots over the weekend were instigated and prepared by the Communist leaders of the worldwide Communist demonstrations against our Vietnam policy.

It is incredible that some students and professors in this country would join hands with the ruthless, bloody Vietcong aggressor in South Vietnam in timing and coordinating these anti-American demonstrations. We are at war against the Red aggressor in South Vietnam. Our Armed Forces are actively engaged in a death struggle to preserve freedom. Demonstrations in the United States are designed to weaken our military position and undermine the morale of our people. These demonstrations are an attack upon this country no less than the Communist attacks upon our men by the aggressor in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to launch an immediate and thorough investigation of these peace demonstrations and teach-ins. Their sinister objectives should be exposed. These demonstrations have duped and hoodwinked some innocent people. These demon-

strations have by design and false propaganda enlisted the support of some well-meaning people. We should expose now the connection between these demonstrations in our country and the worldwide demonstrations called by the Communists to force a withdrawal from South Vietnam. These demonstrations are carefully designed with the ending of the monsoon season in the hope of preventing a complete free world victory in southeast Asia. These demonstrations are a frantic, desperate Communist effort to slow down progress being made by our Armed Forces in South Vietnam.

THE TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Higher Education Act of 1965 is one of the most important elements of the legislative program of the 89th Congress. It contains a brilliant new concept by which master teachers and apprentices will be subsidized by the Federal Government and sent to those local areas most in need of teachers.

This concept, formally entitled the National Teacher Corps, is now under fire by a small minority of my colleagues who claim that it injects an element of Federal influence into local school administration. I do not see the truth or logic in this.

The Teacher Corps members would be assigned at the request of local school authorities and would serve under local control. The teachers would be paid according to the prevailing local salaries. They would teach whatever subjects the employing school assigned them to teach. They would be hired, paid, administered and, if necessary, fired by local authorities.

The need for more teachers is well-known. Last year, nearly 400,000 of our children went to school for less than a full school day because there simply were not enough teachers to go around. There are now nearly 50 million youngsters in our public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. The average teacher-pupil ratio in elementary schools is 28 to 1. In some schools it is as much as 40 to 1. Thus, for too many children are denied the benefits of close contact with the teacher, the individual needs, and talents of these children go unnoticed; the needs unmet; the talents undeveloped.

President Harry S. Truman had a sign on his desk when he was in the White House, which read: "The buck stops here." Hundreds of thousands of our children are carrying similar signs: "The buck stopped here." And they will carry that blight-educational impoverishment for the rest of their lives.

Last month, when schools opened across the country, there was a need for about 250,000 new teachers. This need was not met. Only about 100,000 teachers were recruited. Thus, the children of this Nation were denied the educational opportunities to which they are entitled, by the laws of the land, by our

not seen fit to put this aircraft into use, and it was only after a long, hard struggle that authority was given for the construction of these two experimental models. The more this aircraft flies, the more conquests it makes—and the more Secretary McNamara's decision seems unexplainable.

THEY ARE NOT ALL "PEACENIKS"

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the whistles could be heard from New York to California this past weekend as police tried to keep protesting "peaceniks" in line and prevent riots. It is getting to be a weekend thing to do—staging demonstrations and marches against our involvement in Vietnam's struggle with the Communists.

Whether you live in the big city, in a small town, or even out in the wide open country, you are never far from a lively demonstration. There is no admission charge. All one has to do to join the crowd is to abuse some of the great privileges he has as an American citizen.

As thousands of would-be rioters waged protests in the streets and public squares of our Nation, a quiet dignified group of over 700 young students in Knoxville, Tenn., were also speaking their opinions and backing their Government. They are for freedom. They are against communism. They respect and love their country. They are proud to say: "I am an American." They are not just followers of the crowd. They are not just "out for kicks." They realize the sorrows of families who have members serving in Vietnam. They are supporting these soldiers. They themselves are willing to fight for freedom and against hunger and communism or any other threat to happy and productive lives for all.

There is a great contrast here—between those protesting our service in Vietnam and those who speak out in favor of our fight against communism. I would like to point to specific incidents to show you this vast difference between these two groups of our young society. I think the thousands who marched throughout our Nation, from east to west, in protest of our policy in Vietnam should be ashamed of their actions. But, I am very proud of the young people, their teachers, and ministers who, in dignified ceremony, paid respect to our Nation and thanked the brave men who are making great sacrifices in Vietnam.

The students at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, led by their student president and other campus leaders, let their fellow citizens know that they were for peace and behind their Nation's efforts in Vietnam. Their ceremony was quiet, reverent, dignified, patriotic. This large student gathering on October 14 opened with a solemn pledge of allegiance to the flag as Old Glory unfurled from many directions, displayed by proud Army and Air Force color guards.

The students' leader, David White, president of the student government association, introduced the program:

This is a memorial to our men who have been killed and others who are serving there for each of us.

After short talks and prayers, the University of Tennessee students and many University of Tennessee administrators stood in hushed silence for meditation as the sound of taps was heard across the campus.

The University of Tennessee vote of confidence for the U.S. fight against Communist aggressors was echoed by other groups this weekend. Perhaps the one drawing the largest representation was the reverse teach-in held in our Nation's Capital. Six University of Tennessee students joined college students from throughout the country for a peaceful program in support of the war against the Vietcong.

Let us look at some other scenes of this past weekend. For example, in New York, our largest, most bustling city, an estimated 10,000 marchers protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam swept down famous Fifth Avenue. Unapproving and irritated lookers-on threw red paint at the demonstrators, and even tried to attack them. In Berkeley, Calif., scene of repeated demonstrations, a march was staged. Broken up just as it reached the Oakland city limits, it already had resulted in injury to several of the participants who engaged in scuffles with nondemonstrators, and one police officer was carried away with a broken leg.

But wherever they marched—New York, California, or even in Trafalgar Square, London—the demonstrators met opposition from Americans who are supporting their Nation and who are not afraid to say so. Above the roar of the crowds can be heard such disturbed shouts as "back our troops in Vietnam, you traitors."

Americans have always stood by their Nation through bad times as well as the good times. There has always been thankfulness for our great heritage and for our many freedoms. It is encouraging now to know that the loud, protesting youth are in the minority. They make a lot of noise and they cause a lot of damage to persons and property, but what they say and do cannot override the patriotism of proud Americans.

I am a proud American, happy to represent such dignified young people as those who attend the University of Tennessee. Their demonstration in Knoxville will not win our struggle in Vietnam, but multiply it a few times, and it will be a tremendous boost to our Nation's policy and most of all to the brave Americans who are serving there for each of us.

[Mr. FINDLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order previously granted to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CROPLAND RESTORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, not long ago a Washington newsletter described a "new policy on agriculture" being quietly developed, the scope of which would include: first, the gradual abolishment of production controls; second, the encouragement of greater production; and, third, a vast food bank for the underfed.

I think all would agree that our so-called omnibus farm bill finally approved by the Congress a few days ago will not achieve any of these ends, but that bill does include a title and provision, which, if properly expanded and modified, can bring us closer to the goal of a workable farm policy that will not only benefit the farmer but the consumer human beings throughout the world who depend on him—that farmer—for their food and fiber.

One of the titles of the omnibus farm bill entitled "cropland adjustment" calls for conversion of so-called unneeded cropland to vegetative cover, water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses with a peak participation of 40 million acres envisioned by 1970. The only word with which I strongly disagree is the word "unneeded." In view of the so-called population explosion, we will not only desperately need this acreage; we will need to convert much of it from marginal land to highly productive land, land capable of producing an abundant quantity of food and fiber at reasonable prices and of high nutritive value to consumers, and above all with a fair return for the farmer. This is important domestically if we are to continue to survive. It is paramount internationally if we are to continue the Public Law 480 program and others and be our brother's keepers around the world.

Towards the general principle of constructive farm legislation I have introduced H.R. 7184, whose dominant theme is not cropland adjustment but, rather, cropland restoration. If the small farmer is given the chance to increase the fertility of his low, inefficient acres through a second market for soil restoration, he is at once placed on the same level with the large commercial farm. In addition, he has the advantage of lower labor costs and bargaining power at a level which will keep him in business. Large commercial farms may also take advantage of this second market, but their costs of labor, management, and capital will perhaps be higher. There is an additional advantage, Mr. Speaker, the farmer will have multiple options at the time the Government assayer comes around to review the cover crop and cut a swath and measure the value he will assign to the farmer for a short ton of coverage crop plowed under each year. He may plow it under, and accept the estimated base of \$25 per ton from a grateful Government for a restorative practice. He may say, "No, I will use it for the fertility of my own

New England utilities to furnish a far cheaper alternative. This would be a combination nuclear-power pumped storage development estimated to cost approximately \$71 million including transmission facilities, compared with Dickey's \$300 million price tag. Annual cost of producing power at the alternate facility would be approximately 27 percent less, including taxes, and nearly 50 percent less, excluding taxes, than the estimated annual cost for Dickey.

Another dismal facet of Dickey's economic image is that the project would get the usual substantial, taxpayer-borne interest subsidy and would contribute nothing in the way of national or regional taxes.

If Dickey required the approval of some expert and objective licensing authority, it doubtless wouldn't have a shadow of a chance. But, authorization by a body ruled largely by politics, not statesmanship, is quite another thing. The project was included in the rivers and harbors bill reported favorably last month, on a close vote, by the House Public Works Committee. Prompt approval is expected, provided logrolling legislation does not get snarled up in the Rules Committee.

Construction of Dickey would be a first step toward almost endless possibilities for Federal power activity in the East. Certain to be formed would be a Northeastern Power Administration to take over the so-called marketing. (And if the power couldn't be peddled at cost, it would in all likelihood go for less than cost, as has been the case at Bonneville.) The full import of such a set-up shows clearly in the light of Interior's intention to launch a study of an EHV grid for New England, looking to the possibility of tying in with other area power systems and maybe Canadian systems. Interior's plan also includes continued study and possible redesign of Quoddy to give further consideration to the project's economic benefits "associated with recreation, economic development, and elimination of poverty in the region."

It is no secret, either, that Interior is interested in pumped storage in New England and has far more than a passing interest in the power that may be brought down from Labrador's Churchill Falls.

Should the Government get a solid power foothold in this yet unfederalized area, it would not be beyond reason to expect that its tie-ins eventually would extend from New England to the Tennessee Valley Authority and beyond. And it's a safe bet that somewhere in the process the taxpayer will be shoved between the proverbial irresistible force and immovable object.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the question of the Dickey-Lincoln School project will be before this body again tomorrow in the conference report on S. 2300. At that time, it is my sincere hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will again stand firm in their resolve that the project must be further studied. It seems to me to be in rather poor legislative taste to have Members of the other body, where this project was not even considered in open hearing nor discussed in open debate before its approval, attempt to force their will on the Members of this body, where, after thorough discussion in open hearings, and extended debate on the floor of this Chamber, the decision was made that further study was required. We must stand firm.

No. 194—8

THE 129TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that today is the 129th anniversary of the birth of Ellen Browning Scripps. Mrs. Scripps was born in London, England, and came to this country early in life. She was associated with the Detroit Tribune, the Detroit News, and was one of the founders of the Cleveland Penny Press. Miss Scripps was an outstanding newspaperwoman and her column, "Miss Ellen's Miscellany" was the beginning of what is now known as newspaper features.

She and her brother, Edward Willis Scripps, amassed a great fortune in the newspaper field and, in 1890, Miss Scripps moved to southern California and established her home, in 1897, in La Jolla, Calif. At that time, she was 61 years of age and she dedicated the rest of her life to philanthropy.

Many of the institutions which she founded and endowed are of international reputation. Among these are the La Jolla Scripps Metabolic Clinic, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation, and the Scripps Memorial Hospital. Other public contributions included the Torrey Pines State Park, the La Jolla Public Playground and Community Center, the La Jolla Woman's Club House, the children's pool, Scripps Field, the tower and carillon, and the La Jolla Public Library. She also established the Bishop's School.

Here let me interject a personal note. The Bishop's School is always referred to as the Bishop's School for Girls. One of my nieces attended this school. When I came to Washington, D.C., in 1953, one of my first acquaintances was Congressman FRANK T. Bow, of Ohio. He knew that I came from southern California and he said, "I attended the Bishop's School," and I replied, "FRANK, that is a school for girls. How did you get in?" He informed me that, when he was a boy, the Bishop's School was coeducational and he was a student. When it changed from coeducational to a girl's school, I do not know.

The city of San Diego, of which La Jolla is a part, did, by resolution, designate today as "Ellen Browning Scripps Day" in recognition of her outstanding philanthropy, which included much more than I have narrated above. I know of no other woman in history who has contributed so much of themselves or of their substance to the betterment of mankind.

Miss Scripps died in La Jolla on August 3, 1932, at the age of 96 years. Her name will long live in the memory of man, and especially in the memory of

La Jollans. I am happy to join in the tribute to her.

THE XB-70A HITS MACH 3

(Mr. REINECKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, history was made last week at Edwards Air Force Base in California. The world's most advanced aircraft, the XB-70A, made its 17th flight, and in the process compiled some staggering statistics.

With a gross weight of over 500,000 pounds, the XB-70A climbed to an altitude of 70,000 feet—and attained a speed of mach 3, or three times the speed of sound. In this 1 hour and 47 minutes flight, which began last Thursday, October 14, 1965, at 12:07 p.m., e.d.s.t., the huge XB-70A research plane was piloted by North American Aviation Chief Pilot Alvin S. White and Col. Joseph Cotton, chief XB-70 project pilot for the U.S. Air Force.

Last Thursday's flight was the first time that this magnificent aircraft attained its designed cruise speed of over 2,000 miles per hour, and this achievement is of great significance in aviation, for it is this same cruise speed that our supersonic transports will someday attain.

About 70 percent of the XB-70A, which was built by North American Aviation, is made of stainless steel honeycomb—the first time such a form of steel has ever been used. The entire forward section of the craft is made of titanium, a metal which can withstand temperatures much higher than those which can be tolerated by aluminum. Featured in the airplane are the most sophisticated hydraulic and electrical systems ever devised—an electrical system that can withstand temperatures of 600° and the first 4,000-pound-per-square-inch hydraulic system. The cabin environmental system will allow the crew to fly in the comfort of 70° and 8,000-foot cabin pressure, even though the actual altitude is about 70,000 feet and the skin temperature of the aircraft is above 630°.

Mr. Speaker, this plane has been flying for exactly 1 year, and the officials and employees of North American Aviation, Inc., are to be congratulated for this remarkable contribution to America's future. The research data gathered is the most significant information applicable to the U.S. supersonic transport program which is so vital to our Nation.

The pilots of this aircraft, and all of those who have worked on the important XB-70 program, deserve the praise of a Nation which is grateful for the contributions these people have made toward the advancement of aeronautical science.

In view of the remarkable achievements of the XB-70A, it seems incredible that this aircraft will not go into production. Two of these planes have been built, but the Secretary of Defense has